# Theological Magazine

of the

## Evangelical Synod of North America.

Published by the Evangelical Synod of North America. Price per year (six numbers) $2.00; to foreign countries, $2.20. Rev. H. Kamphausen, Dr. theol. (Giessen Univ.), 1956 W. Boulevard, Cleveland, Ohio, Editor.

All communications relating to editorial work, all contributions and exchanges must be addressed to the editor.

All communications relating to business matters must be addressed to Eden Publishing House, 1712-24 Chouteau Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

VOL. 60 ST. LOUIS, MO. SEPT. 1, 1932.

## THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM

By the Editor

Since a merger of our Synod with the Reformed Church in the United States is under discussion it behooves us to seek closer acquaintance with the Heidelberg Catechism. This Catechism remains to this day the confession of faith of the Reformed Church and its only lawfully recognized book of instruction for its youth. It will, therefore, better than any other book introduce us to the doctrinal teachings of the Reformed Church and enable us to see where we agree with them and where we differ. Our Confessional Paragraph mentions the Heidelberg Catechism as one of the symbolical books of the Reformed Church, but it is not on that account to be assumed that the average minister is well acquainted with it. The Augsburg Confession is also named in that connection, and there are, we believe, not so very many of our ministers who are on terms of familiarity with that famous book.

Our study will naturally be confined within narrow limits. It would take us too far afield to discuss the catechism in all its parts. Nor is it necessary, for one should remember that our object is not to suggest the Heidelberg Catechism as a possible substitute for our own. The "Plan of Union" leaves each side in the possession of its present confessional standards. No proselytizing is to be indulged in on the one side or the other.

Our Church has always been a church with a union platform, although in some respects it may be said that it cherished a mild Lutheranism in the past. Now for the first time in its history we are given an opportunity to effect a union with a Reformed Church.

What is more natural than the desire to see whether they are very different from us, doctrinally, or rather, whether our fathers were were not right in thinking that it would be better for Lutherans and Reformed to get together instead of staying apart. The Heidelberg Catechism whereby the young and the old in the Reformed Church have been indoctrinated for nearly four hundred years, will give us all the light we need.

## History

The sixteenth century was very prolific in the production of catechisms. If the Reformation was introduced into a country or free city, it was done by the princes or magistrates, according to the principle, then generally accepted: "Cuius regio, eius religio" (To whose country I belong, his religion I accept). The people were not consulted. The princes might seek advice from their theologians, but the power to reform was theirs. Political sovereignty was entitled to exact religious conformity. Of course the pope's contention was that no one had any right to depart from the Catholic Church. But the Protestant princes had, in years of fight, obtained from the emperor and the diet the right to introduce religious reform into their lands. The Augsburg Confession (unaltered or altered) was the protecting symbol of the Reformed states.

If the Reformation introduced by the decrees of the government was to have any real value it was obviously imperative that religious instruction should prepare young and old for the new religion. Hence it is no wonder that new catechisms sprang up like mushrooms. It is claimed that at least one hundred and fifty catechetical handbooks saw the light in the century of the Reformation. In the Lutheran Church, the great Reformer's Small Catechism headed all the others. Owing to Luther's overwhelming personality his catechism crowded out all the rest. In the Reformed Church, Calvin's strength did not lie in popular instruction. His catechism did not have the success he had hoped for it. His penetrating intellect enabled him to become one of the first founders of a great theological system in Protestantism ("Institutio Religionis Christianae"). But his very intellectualism barred him from competing with Luther in the catechetical field.

Of the numberless catechisms that came to life in the Reformed Church, the Heidelberg Catechism is the only one that can compare with Luther's Small Catechism in influence and wide acceptance. Luther is the German Reformer par excellence. His personality, German to the core, won the heart of the German people. Only small parts of Germany opened themselves to the influence of the Swiss (Zwingli) and French Reformers (Calvin).

## Frederick III.

Nevertheless, along the Lower Rhine (the later "Rhine province") and the upper Rhine (especially in the palatinate), the Reformed Church found a fertile soil. Among the causes which brought this about, the elector Frederick III of the Palatinate (called the Pious) the son of the famous Otto Henry (visitors to the Heidelberg Castle will remember the ruins of the Otto-Heinrichsbau: it was erected under him) played an important part. When Frederick came to succeed his father dissensions between the High-Lutherans and the milder Melanchthonians were very bitter. The former were utterly hostile to the Zwinglians and Calvinists, whom they called "sects". On the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, especially, they took an extreme stand. Not only was the bread the *true* body of Christ, and the wine the true blood. They were to be partaken of orally (with the mouth) by the worshipers. Believers and unbelievers both received the body and blood of Christ, the latter to their judgment. Because the body of Christ was really present at every communion table, they taught the "ubiquity" of the body.

Frederick, although calling himself then a Lutheran, of the mild type, was averse to these extreme teachings and came to lean more and more to a view which would include the Calvinists. His interest in theological matters was very keen, he was a careful student of the Word and a spiritual man. It seemed to him that his people needed an authoritative book setting forth the important teachings of the Bible in a plain, popular and yet adequate way. But he could not very well issue a fullfledged Creed of his own, for the Protestants had a Creed, the Augsburg Confession of 1530 (or the altered Augsburg Confession of 1540). This Creed alone had been officially recognized. To put forth a new Creed would take the protection of the Augsburg Confession from him and his people and was, therefore, too dangerous. He tried a middle course. He had a book composed that would not just be a pretentious creed but a handbook for the instruction of the young, at the same time sufficiently elaborate to serve as a popular creed. Calling it a catechism was not a deception but it was apt to draw less fire than the term "creed" would have done.

For this work he enlisted the services of two young theologians (26 and 28 years old) stationed at Heidelberg, *Zacharias Ursinus* and *Caspar Olevianus*. Ursinus was born in Breslau, had studied at Wittenberg under Melanchthon and later, under Calvin at Geneva. Olevianus had preached the gospel at Treves (Trier), been imprisoned by the bishop but liberated by the elector Frederick. In building their catechism they availed themselves of all the help the attempts of others could give them. Their work was

so well done that when the catechism was published, in 1563, it soon outran all competitors. The elector was especially pleased. He considered it his own catechism and when threatened with loss of position on its account, he defended it so well at the diet at Augsburg that no one dared to interfere with him. The duke of Saxony clapped him on the shoulder in the presence of the emperor and the princes, saying: "Fritz, you are more pious than any of us."

In the year 1618, at the Synod of Dort, which was composed of Reformed delegates from all countries, the Heidelberg Catechism was recognized as the confession of faith of the whole Reformed Church of all tongues.

### Good Points

Its marvelous success is attributed by its friends to three causes. First, it was an irenic catechism. Composed by the elector's chosen men in order to heal the religious dissensions of his country, it was temperate in its statements on the distinctive points between Lutherans and Reformed. It was the only catechism that held its hand out to both the warring churches; the only one with the idea of ultimate union in mind.

Then it satisfied those in the Reformed Church who looked for a creed, a confessional standard that could take for them the place of the Augsburg Confession (later the "Book of Concord") occupied in the Lutheran Church. The Reformed Church has never produced anything that could compete in elaborateness or authority with the Augsburg Confession. Putting the emphasis on life more than doctrine, they contented themselves with the Heidelberg Catechism as the quiver for their theological arrows.

Finally, there is in the Heidelberg Catechism a note of spiritual experience. It is not a cold statement of orthodox beliefs. Again and again there bursts forth the personal tone of joyful faith and victorious trust. Compare especially the first question: "What is your only comfort in life and death?" And in other places; Dr. Good in his "The Heidelberg Catechism in Its Newest Light" enumerates seventeen passages of this kind.

### Structure of the Heidelberg Catechism

Taking up now the structure of the Catechism, we naturally find in it the conventional "five principal parts," but they are systematically arranged. Three things are necessary for me to know, it says, if I am to enjoy the comfort of saving faith:

1. the greatness of my sin and misery;
2. how I am redeemed from it
3. how I am to be thankful to God for such redemption.

The first part shows that knowledge of sin comes out of the law of God as summarized in Matt. 22 (love God and your neighbor). The second part deals with the redemption by Jesus Christ, discussed under the three articles of the Christian faith and followed by the interpretation of justification, the sacraments and the office of the Keys. The third part deals with the thankfulness of the Christian, his new life as founded on conversion, having its norm in the decalogue and its most natural expression in prayer.

It is easy to criticize this arrangement. For instance, on the very unequal length of the three parts (1st part: questions 3-11; 2nd part: questions 12-85; 3rd part: questions 86-129). Or on the position of the ten commandments, or of prayer. This writer has always had the idea that the whole contents of the catechism should be found a place for under the three articles. Salvation in Christ could be made the central thought. This subdivided into three parts:

1. the world made ready for it (1st article);
2. the salvation come (2nd article);
3. salvation assimilated (3rd article).

In this case the commandments would come under the first part.

The catechism, although irenic (as said before) still bears the Calvinistic stamp. This is seen in its reference everywhere and from its very publication, over every earthly authority, to the Bible; in the importance it attaches to the office of the Keys and the discipline over its members it exacts of the church; its prohibition of pictures in the church; its extreme language on profanity ("no sin greater than profaning of God's name"); its strong emphasis on the works as evidences of true faith.

Nevertheless, the really objectionable features of Calvinism are wholly absent. Calvin makes the sovereignty of God the ruling idea of his faith and system. The Heidelberg Catechism proclaims as much as any Lutheran the divine love, the love of him who is in Christ our father, gathering from it the firm faith in his kind providence.

Calvin's predestination theory is conspicuously kept out of the Heidelberg Catechism. The only time election is mentioned is in questions 52-54. It is used to give the believer the comfort that God will preserve him for ever as a living member of his kingdom.

### The Sacraments

For our present purpose the matter of highest interest is the interpretation of the sacraments given by the Heidelberg Catechism as compared with our own. (They are treated under the third article as means to strengthen faith, same as in our catechism). The average layman (and minister too) thinks of the sacraments first

when the rift between the two great branches of Protestantism comes to mind. Our own catechism, it is well known, was mildly Lutheran. It reflects the standpoint of its author, A. Irion. According to him, in baptism God imparts the new life to man. This gift of the new life the children are as needy and capable of receiving as adults; therefore we are justified in practising infant baptism. To Irion, then, every baptized child had the germ of the new life in him. This germinal new life (as Irion explains in his "Erklaerung") was to come into blossom, under Christian training, in the experience of personal conversion.

We do not know how many of our pastors agree, with Irion and the catechism, that baptism plants the germ of the new life in the person baptized; and that babes are just as capable of receiving it as adults. The present writer finds his own position more nearly stated in the Heidelberg Catechism according to which the sacraments are signs and seals whereby Christ *teaches* us (in a sacramental way) and *assures* us that his salvation is ours. The water of baptism is a sign and a seal of the cleansing blood of Christ. In infant baptism the child is "ingrafted into the Christian Church." Redemption and the Holy Spirit are *promised* to them no less than to the parents.

And as the water of baptism is the divine token and assurance of the forgiveness of sin, so is the bread and wine of the Supper the visible sign and pledge that we are the partakers of his true body and blood. "As certainly as I receive from the hand of the minister, and taste with my mouth, the bread and cup of the Lord, just as surely is my soul fed and nourished with his crucified body and blood." These two things the Heidelberg Catechism emphasizes again and again in its interpretation of the sacraments: that they are a new form of *teaching* the gospel and a strong personal *pledge* to make our assurance doubly sure. This writer has always found great help to his faith in this particularly Reformed feature of sacramental exposition. The Heidelberg Catechism labors hard to meet the Lutherans as far as possible in giving the Lord's Supper its full value; and it can be said that in doing this the doctrinal armor weights its steps quite heavily at times. But we must remember with what tremendous emphasis Lutheran Germany leaned upon this doctrine from the very beginning. Luther rejected the hand Zwingli reached out to him at Marburg. The Heidelberg Catechism has more to offer on the Sacraments than Zwingli could: Who would, in 1932, want to reject the hand of Calvin as, in 1529, the hand of Zwingli was brushed aside?

In all other points the Reformed are standing shoulder to shoulder with us. The great Reformation doctrine of justification by faith could not be more emphatically sustained by us than it

is in the Heidelberg Catechism (see especially the famous question 60). In fact, the Heidelberg Catechism is often criticized as putting too much stress on doctrines and ancient forms of thought, even as ours is so criticized. Professor Geo. W. Richards, in his "Studies on the Heidelberg Catechism" raises a number of *objections* to it. One of them is that the doctrinal systems of the catechisms no longer satisfy the religious consciousness of our times. One sees this objection is not confined to the Heidelberg Catechism. Dr. Good, in the work quoted above, takes Richards energetically to task for his stand. But we admit that the Heidelberg Catechism is often extreme in its statements. For instance, when it says in question 5 that "I am by nature prone to hate God and my neighbor," it seems to teach the total depravity of the natural man. It may also be said that in its substitution theory, in its imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the sinner, it uses thought-forms that do not appeal to the modern Christian as they did to the Christian of the sixteenth century. But these criticisms naturally apply to our catechism and others, almost in the same way.

Dr. Richards in his "Studies" does not only raise objection to the doctrinal statements of the Heidelberg Catechism. He also blames it for being behind the times in its *pedagogical* methods. Not only, he says, does the Heidelberg Catechism discuss questions of abstract doctrine, which have lost their significance for our age. "The material in the catechism, also, is not adapted to the child, neither in his intellectual capacity nor to his religious experience."

Here we have reached a point where in both of our churches the minds are, if not in turmoil, at least in a state of considerable ferment. The catechisms, most of us feel, make too much of dogmatics, while the spirit of the times is interested in ethics or in practical questions. Religion insists on faith while the "man in the street" demands works. It is a common thing to say today, I don't care what a man believes if he only lives right. The Christian religion claims absolute truth, Christ is the only way. The present age believes there are many ways, and tolerance and sweet reasonableness are the great virtues. Christ is looked upon, even by Christian teachers, as the great example and inspiration, but not as the Savior.

No wonder that catechisms that owe their origin to a situation in existence four hundred years ago and mainly to the antagonism between Protestantism and Catholicism, fit but poorly into the present time. But how are we to remedy this? We certainly could not be content with teaching a bare morality or even Christian "ideals". We cannot get along without a living communion with the Father in Christ. But a catechism founded on the essentials

and yet progressive and in harmony with modern needs has not yet been produced.

What shall we do in the meantime? We should avail ourselves of all the help the catechism can give in its present shape, laying little weight on memorizing its doctrinal material, cutting down its inordinate length (129 questions in the Heidelberg Catechism, 137 in ours) to reasonable dimensions and adapting ourselves to the needs and understanding of our pupils as closely as possible. A condensed and carefully chosen table of Bible stories should occupy at least one half of our time of instruction. A goodly number of Bible verses memorized are a valuable treasure for the coming years.

Our time cries like no other for a union of the Christian forces. It yearns for reality. With an ever smaller respect for unessential differences, it craves the genuine, the life-changing and uplifting power of the religious life. Organic union of the whole Christian Church is today, at best, only a fair dream. The merger of kindred denominations has come to pass already in a number of instances. What would be more natural than such a merger between the Evangelical Synod of North America and the Reformed Church in the United States? What are the two Churches going to do about it?

# CHARACTER EDUCATION

A. A. Susott

Education began with the attempt to train children in the folkways or mores of the group. With the gradual development of civilization and its arts, the scope of education widened, first for the select few, and now for the great majority. Education is no longer primarily concerned with the training in folkways, but with reading, writing, mathematics, the arts generally, and, in some measure, manual training. As the curriculum of education has grown, the emphasis on the development of the individual in the folkways has decreased, until there has come about an almost total separation between education and individual development. Many objections might be cited to the training in folkways, to the development in the child of the conscious relationship with the ways of the society in which he lives, but it did do one thing, it developed certain aspects of personality that we are neglecting today. That is the development of character. The average child learns little under our present school system beyond a superficial acquaintance with those studies that are supposed to give him knowledge.

In consequence a generation is developing which has little or no use for the higher values of life, that does not seek to discover the good, but seeks selfishly its own pleasure. As a matter of course, a philosophy of life is being developed that destroys all values, and takes all meaning out of life. The old is scrapped without consideration, nothing new is added that would replace the values contained in the old. So our education has degenerated into a simple process of filling the child with all sorts of facts, much as a car is loaded with wheat, and leaving him to struggle along as best he can with the load. No principle of integration is given him, and, so far as the school is concerned, his life is complete when he has "mastered" certain facts and principles.

With advancing civilization, there is a need for constantly increasing knowledge, and a place for better educational method. But there needs to be something more than this: there needs to be the *development of character,* the giving—so far as that is possible—of an integrating principle in our process of education. In other words, there needs to be that training of the selfhood that will enable the individual to make intelligent use of what he has learned, and that development of character that will enable him to choose the good. This is not an easy task. Insofar as it is being done today, it is being done by the home and the church. In the past, this has been fairly effective, due to the generous amount of home life and the time given to the church. Today many homes are

in themselves disorganized and disrupted: so many that a very large percentage of our children never know the meaning of real home environment. The church comes into real contact with only a few, into superficial contact with less than fifty percent, and into no contact at all with the majority. That leaves the school as the only organization that actually reaches virtually every child, hence the duty of integrating life and developing character falls upon the school.

But how can the school do justice to this great task? In the past the school has done a great deal, not officially, but unofficially, through the number of its consecrated teachers. These teachers have not hesitated to go to a great deal of effort outside of curriculum hours and requirements in order to develop those traits in children that are desirable. But more than this needs to be done, the school needs to concern itself officially about the development of character. Unless it does so, our civilization will tend to be destroyed by forces within itself. History shows us that in every instance in the past when character education was neglected, the result has been the downfall of a nation, of a people, of a civilization. Out of the past we ought to learn enough to save ourselves and that which we hold to be of value. This is the work of education, and education depends, in this country, upon the public schools.

The influence of the school upon the character of he individual is both voluntary and involuntary, directed and casual, conscious and accidental. In its directed aspect it requires a definite objective, and plans for reaching them. In its casual aspect it influences the pupil without definite objective. This aspect is as important as conscious direction, for the pupil absorbs the atmosphere in which he lives and adjusts himself accordingly. Thus a school may on the one hand have a directed program of character education that is purposeful and valuable, and yet may destroy its own work by the general atmosphere of the school. This happens often in Sunday Schools and Week Day Schools of Religion, as well as in public schools. The whole influence of the school should be such that character development results, and as much attention should be directed to the casual atmosphere of the school, as to the articulated program. Social values are best inculcated by social living, and that social living is of necessity based upon the two factors of instruction and practice. The instruction is fairly easy to give, it is harder to control the experiences of the pupil in such a way that character growth is the natural result.

Yet it is in the controlled part of the program that the school can make its influence felt in the life of the pupil, and by means of which it contributes most to the development of his character.

The effect of the casual influence is to a great extent dependent upon the program that has been developed with the definite objective in mind. The school has today worked out a very definite program for the work it is trying to do, and while methods are constantly changing, yet in the main they are and for a long time have been successfully meeting their objectives. It is only now that we are coming to see that an important phase of education is being omitted, and the curriculum needs to be so revised as to include definite plans for character education. Schools have come to see the need of physical education as well as mental, and now they need to see the need for spiritual development as well. To this end, a new program needs to be worked out which will have the growth of Christian prsonality as its objective.

The details of such a program will need to be left to those who make of education in the public schools a special study, and who have the opportunity for direct observation and experimentation. The most a layman can hope to do, is to suggest certain items that might aid in the development of a program of what might be called "character education." The past few years have seen attempts on the part of a number of school officials to develop such items, by means of citizenship-rating, and other forms of scoring and training. The chief objection that might be voiced against all forms I have studied, is that they lack motivation. School and class-room grades cannot follow us through life, and the correct answer as to what should be done in a given instance does not imply that the answerer will care to do what he knows to be right, especially when his own personal desires might be involved. These are necessary steps toward the development of a program, but they are in themselves superficial and do not go to the heart of the problem. What is needed is a sufficient motivation, a motivation that will not end when the last grade of school is finished, but one that will be adequate for life.

Such a motivation can come only from religion. Religion alone is capable of supplying that integrating principle that gives meaning to life, enabling the individual to make use of all he has learned, and at the same time to supply a reason for living according to the highest conceivable moral and ethical codes. Thus, while the school will be training, as did the school of old, in the folkways of the group, it will be constantly pointing the way to supersede the old mores and replace them with better. This is necessary if civilization—nay, if mankind—is to endure. As we are concerned about improvement in material wellbeing, so we need to be concerned about improvement in spiritual well-being. The only possibility of achieving higher standards of moral life is by means of religion. Hence the public school needs to devote itself

in some measure to the teaching of religion, and in larger measure to the development of religious life in its pupils.

It is at this point that the greatest opposition will arise, and that from two sources. On the one hand a rabid denominationalism will oppose the teaching of religion on the ground that it will be taught falsely, and will fight hard against the introduction of religion into the public schools because they are afraid of losing an occasional lamb to some other flock. Rather let the whole flock go lost, than to lose one lamb to some other fold! The present warfare between liberal and conservative thought will also make for conflict. Thus will the forces of religion themselves fight against the introduction of religious education in the schools. On the other hand, the non-religious group is very strong, and would also oppose the introduction of religion into the schools on various grounds. We are at present not concerned with answering the arguments of either group, we simply indicate that we know that such opposition exists and that it will fight desperately against the introduction of religion into the public schools. Most battles for the betterment of the public schools have been won only after tragic conflicts. But they have been won.

To harmonize the conflicting lines of thought in regard to religious education is impossible. We recognize that something more is absolutely essential in our public school system. Not all would agree that that which we need is religion. Yet many of our best educators do agree that religion is the only process that can vitalize and unify life. There is no other integrating principle that goes with the individual from the cradle to the grave. There is no other motive that has ever been advanced that is sufficient to overcome selfishness and despair. God is the answer to man's needs. Every attempt of a people to get along without Him has ended in failure. The religious ideal is essential to the development of the good. The religious ideal is itself the subject of development, as we learn from the study of the history of religion and comparative religions. But the religious ideal always leads, and supplies the motive for right living.

Developing a curriculum in which religious education will find an adequate place is a matter of great difficulty, but it can be done. There are two phases that need to receive emphasis, one, the direct teaching of religion as a distinct part of the curriculum. two, the indirect application of religious principles to the various studies, where such application is possible. Perhaps the greatest danger we face is that such instruction will become mere preachment, which would be fatal to any success of such a program. Back of the whole program there needs to be a group of teachers who are really interested in the development of personality, and who

will devote themselves to this task without fear of hardships or ridicule. It will require more, not less, of our whole teaching staff, and of the institutions of training. A background of religious training and experience is essential to the success of the program. It will not be a success unless those who administer it do so wisely and well. After all, a curriculum is only a tool, and can be used to botch up a job as well as do it splendidly.

In regard to a direct curriculum for teaching religion, care needs to be taken to bring out the spiritual truths, and to avoid, so far as possible, those ideas which stir up dissension. An indication of what can be done along the line of developing text books full of religious meaning is to be found in "Standard Bible Story Readers" by Lillie A. Faris, published by the Standard Publishing Company of Cincinnati, Ohio. Lillie A. Faris is First Grade critic teacher, College of Education of Ohio University, Athens, O. Bible stories, poems, psalms, songs, and beautiful pictures make these readers valuable. For the younger classes such a reading course would doubtless be of great benefit. Older classes could have, besides the stories, such teaching as is contained in the Sermon on the Mount and the parables of Jesus. For high school students the message of the prophets, the writings of the New Testament would be helpful in developing religious outlook on life. Included in this course there would naturally be the study of many of the leaders of the church.

This education in religion should be confined primarily to the Christian religion, but it should recognize and give some understanding of other religions as well. Nearly every religion has stories and teachings that are helpful in the development of character and personality. The spiritual value of any religion should be noted and given its proper place. Religious motive and value in history should be noted, so too the study of science should lead us on to God. The opportunity for education in religion—and I mean vital education, not mere preachment—is almost unlimited. Religion alone helps the individual to integrate the various branches of learning, and to make the most of his own life.

Such education in religion is not only a matter of curriculum, or class room, but also a matter of attitudes in the school and at play. Fair play, honesty, helpfulness, consideration, these are all matters of religion. Right attitudes need to be developed in every instance, and the pupil needs to learn of his dependence upon and fellowship with God. Therefore there should be at some time during the day, a short period of devotion for each grade. There is something inspiring about the flag ritual that helps the child to visualize his country: so he needs a daily reminder of God's nearness. A simple devotion, consisting perhaps of a hymn, a scripture pas-

sage, and a prayer, or perhaps simply the story of some religious event in the life of some man, or perhaps the reading of a poem that stirs emotional response—any one of a number of things can bring about a spirit of devotion. Thus man's need for help outside himself finds its proper answer in God, his desire for a fellowship that does not grow old is satisfied in God, and his requirement for an adequate stimulus to live well is met. Education will not be satisfactory until it includes religion, and makes it vital.

---

Reference works used:

Principles of Religious Education—Emme and Stevick.
Religious Education—Soares.
What is Christian Education?—Coe.
Common Sense in Education—Bell.
Creative Education—Osborn.
The Approach to Religious Education—Yeaxlee.
The Evolution of the Common School—Reisner.
International Journal of Rel. Ed.—Religious Educational Journal.

# SERMON SKETCHES

By H. J. Schick, S.T.D.

September 4

Labor Day Sunday

Topic: *The Christ and Labor.*

Text: Luke 22 : 27 : "I am among you as one who serveth."

This Sunday is known as Labor Day Sunday. It preaches the Gospel of Labor. It points to the greatest laborer and friend of labor,——the Christ our Lord. It recalls to mind the poem of Van Dyke:

"This is the Gospel of Labor,
Ring it, ye bells of the kirk,
The Lord of Love came down from above
To live with the men who work"—

Christ has dignified labor. He made it an exalted, a sacred and a blessed thing.

The Maison du Peuple in Brussels is a workshop erected by the workingmen,—a hive of many activities. In its great lecture hall is a beautiful painting of the Christ, with hand uplifted, pointing the way above.—Thus Labor Day Sunday shows us the great work-shop of the world,—a hive of many activities. In the midst of it all, pointing the way to Heaven, is the Christ.

Let us note three things in regard to Labor.

I.

The *Example and Pattern* for our labor—the Christ our Lord.

His revolutionizing statement: "I am among you as one who serveth." He has given us an example of unselfish, untiring, humble and blessed service. Witness Him at Cana, Nain, Capernaum, —at Jericho, Samaria, Bethsaida,—at Gethsemane, Gabbatha, Golgotha. He forgot His own needs, His own pain and suffering in His effort to serve humanity, to break the shackles of sin, Satan and death. And when we forget ourselves,——our pride, our ease, our needs, in order to serve the Christ, the Church and Humanity, we are emulating His glorious example.

"Christ the great Example is and Pattern for me."

II.

*The Manner of our labor.*

(a) It should be rendered *joyfully.*

"Thank God for the swing of it,
For the clamoring, hammering ring of it,
Passion of labor daily hurled
On the mighty anvils of the world—

Thank God for the world where none may shirk,
Thank God for the splendor of work"—

Are we happy in the Lord's work? Can we truthfully say: "I delight to do Thy will, O God?"

(b) Our labor should be done *faithfully.* God has a plan for every soul. There is a special work for each to do. Let us not be shirkers, but workers. Be faithful!

(c) Our labor should be done *co-operatively.* Team-work! Every one doing his best, and doing it in co-operation with others.

III.

*The Reward for our labor.*

It comprises blessings *here:* peace, happiness, pardon, life. But in the *hereafter* it means: eternal bliss and glory. At the close of earthly labors the Lord will say: "Well done, etc." Thereupon the eternal home, rest, peace.—Now it reads: "I am among you as one who serveth." But then it shall be: "They shall reign with Him forever and ever."

## September 11

### Participation Sunday

Topic: *"Three Important Words: Come—Abide—Go."*

Texts: Matt. 11: 28: "Come unto Me." John 15: 4: "Abide in me".—Matt. 28: 10: "Go, work."

After vacation days the Church invites all her organizations and members to renewed activity. After a period of rest—the privilege of growth in spiritual things through joyful and sincere service. The Church invites all her children to participate in blessings which the Christ has to offer. The invitation is extended in three great words of Jesus: "Come—Abide—Go."

I. Come

A word of only four letters, but filled with deepest meaning. It stands at the beginning of the Bible and we also find it at the close of the Word of God,—as well as all the way between. Over 600 times in Holy Writ.

We use that word today as *an invitation* to come and find comfort and strength in the Christ. Countless are the number of persons who have been helped and blessed. When all other resources gave out, they found help in God. When everything else looked dark, they emerged out of darkness of defeat into the light of liberty.

Come! There is today just as much mercy and power in God, as there was long ago!

*How shall we come?* Come 1) believing; 2) praying; 3) trusting.

Come into the Ark of the Church and be saved.

Come, join the followers of Jesus, the greatest and noblest company on earth.

### II. Abide

The second great word is: Abide. Again and again we are admonished to abide in God, in Christ, in His Word, in His love. We are to abide as the branches abide in the vine.—Apart from the vine they become lifeless, fruitless.—If we abide in Christ, His life, peace, joy, power and victory will be ours.

We are to abide, no matter what happens, even though the earth be moved and the mountains be carried into the midst of the seas.

Abide in Christ! Then, when other helpers fail and comforts flee, you may trustingly pray: Help of the helpless, O abide with me!—And He will still the storm—and bring you safely to land.

### III. Go

The third great word is: Go. Go and work! Go and teach! Go and tell others! Go into all the world! We have a great task to do! We are not to waste our time on trivialities. It is the Christ who sends us! It is God who depends on us! The coming months will give new opportunities to serve, to pray, to give, to comfort, to strengthen, to build, to extend,—Go! The Church sincerely, earnestly and ocrdially invites you to participate.

## September 18

Topic: *"Why we need the Church."*

Text: Heb. 10: 25: "Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is."

The Christian Church is the greatest organization in the world. It has more members, more leaders, more publications, more institutions than any other organization in the world. It has meant more to humanity than all other institutions formed by the mind and hands of men. It is the only organization in the world that can look back to Jesus as its founder. In these days when we are rallying our forces for the coming fall and winter, it is well to stress our need of the Church. Why do we need the church? Because the Church stands unalterably for certain great truths. First of all, it stands for

### God

God is the great answer and the only answer for every human need. There are tribes without written speech and government and marriage-code, but no tribe without its deity. The God-instinct is universal. This is all the more remarkable, because it runs athwart

the natural grain of life,—It lays a tax upon the time, the talent, the possessions, the duties of man. It asks for altars and temples, priests and sacrifices. Why doesn't human reason tear out this irksome belief? Because it is as deeply rooted as humanity itself. Every temple witnesses to the need of God. Every steeple points to the heart of the All-Father, whose throne is in the heavens, and whose foot-stool is the earth.

We need the Church, because it stands for

WORSHIP

The Greek word for man is "anthropos." It means "the upward-looking one." "Man is the creature of religious instincts and must worship something" (Kant). It is heart-hunger for God. Men in every land have this hunger. Some seek to satisfy it by worshipping sun, moon, stars, idols, powers of nature. Our souls cry out for God, the living God, and we come to His House for satisfaction. Great changes may sweep the fields of political government—the fields of industry and commerce—the laboratories of science,—but as long as man is man, he needs the church as a place to worship God. There is no substitute.

We need the Church, because it stands for

HOLINESS

The Church energizes men and women and youth for finer and nobler living. It gives man a new sense of values, that enrich his own life and that of others. It teaches the fine art of building character. It heals wounds—pours oil upon troubled waters—proclaims the gospel of brotherhood and good-will. It stands for unflinching antagonism to unrighteousness. It upholds the standards of truth and justice, equality and liberty. The Church is the only hope of America and of the world, the only intermediary between the various classes, the only healing ointment for the sores and bruises of mankind, the only antidote to the virus of humanity's sins.

Let us therefore support the Church in its great healing, preaching, and uplifting ministry.

Let no sacrifice be too great, no burden too heavy for the sake of the Church. Let us be true and faithful followers of Him who founded the Church. Let us help the Church stand inspirationally and potently for God, Worship and Holiness.

September 25

Topic: *"The Grace of Giving."*

Text: "Acts 20: 35—"It is more blessed to give than to receive."

It is blessed to receive, to be loved, to be ministered unto. But the blessedness of giving is much greater, for it brings greater happiness, a higher quality of joy, and is the mark of a nobler character.—In these days of depression many people are tempted to neglect giving,—regard giving as a hardship. Should be regarded as a privilege,—a part of worship.—Let us note some things about the grace of giving.

I.—The Great Example

(a) *God.* He is the greatest giver. Can you imagine God as niggardly? He "so loved that He gave." John 3. 16.

(b) *Jesus.* "For your sakes He became poor"—2 Cor. 8: 9. He "gave himself a ransom." 1 Tim. 2: 6. He "loved the Church and gave himself for it." Eph. 5: 25. What a great example—what a strong incentive to become like God.

II.—The First Requisite

The example of the Philippians: gave themselves first. 2 Cor. 8: 5. Giving yourselves first, it is easy to give money. Giving yourselves, you give everything. The hand and the open purse follow the giving of the heart.

III.—The True Proportion

As God prospers the giver. 1 Cor. 16: 2. Often more is spent in one hour of pleasure than is given to God for a whole year. "Will a man rob God?" Mal. 3: 8. Money, talents, influence are given to us in trust. We are only stewards of our possessions. We are accountable for the use we make of them to God. Give, as God has prospered you.

IV.—The Right Time

"On the first day of the week" 1 Cor. 16: 2. Not once per year. Not spasmodically. Not "when you feel like it." But systematically. One should regulate his giving by principle, not by mood. The church will never make great progress for Christ so long as our gifts rest upon spasmodic emotion rather than upon conscience.

V.—The Best Manner

(a) Cheerfully—2 Cor. 9: 7; (b) Willingly—2 Cor. 8: 11; (c) With liberality—Rom. 12: 8.

VI.—The Unlimited Source

"Every good gift and every perfect gift comes from above"—Jas. 1: 17. "Ask, and it shall be given you"—Matt. 7: 7-11.—All comes from God—He is rich above all that call upon Him—God never requires us to do more than our part, or to give more than He has given us. As long as God gives to us, we must give back to Him.

VII. The Divine Assurance

He will supply every need. "Prove me now herewith—" Mal. 3: 10. David's experience: "I have been young, and am now old, yet never seen the righteous forsaken or his seed begging bread." Ps. 37: 25.

VIII.—Completing the Circle of Virtue

"As ye abound in everything, see that ye abound in this grace also." 2 Cor. 8: 7.

October 2

Topic: *"The Gospel—A Power.*

Text: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is a power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth." Rom. 1: 16.

When the Apostle Paul spoke of "power," he caught the attention of the Romans. They knew what power was. Their city was built on a foundation of power. They prospered through power. Their conquests were enormous and all made possible through power.

Like the ancients the quest of the moderns is for power. We hear of water-power; steam-power; electric-power; magnetic-power; atomic-power. Ours is an age where power plays a magnificent role. And many are its worshippers.

But the Apostle Paul speaks of a different power. It is the power of the Gospel.

Let us note first

I.—The Purpose of that Power

(a) It is *to save from sin.* Sin is a terrible power. It blemishes, undermines, destroys. In our jails are thousands of people. What brought them there? It is sin. In our land are thousands of destroyed homes. What terrible power did it? Sin. In the whole world countless blasted hopes, dreams, lives. What wrought the havoc? Sin. The Gospel is the only power under heaven and on earth that can save from the terrible power of sin. The Gospel is a power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth!"

(b) The Gospel is also a power *to save from eternal death.* You cannot stop death. You can postpone it. You can prolong life by careful living,—five—ten, or more years—but you cannot stop death.—Every tick of the clock is the knell of a departing spirit,—3600 every hour—86400 every day. But physical death is not the greatest foe,—eternal death looms up in terrible shape and power. Through the power of the Gospel physical death is transformed and glorified, and eternal death is vanquished.—The Apostle said in substance to the proud Romans: "Behold your emperors—your orators—your statesmen—powerful—yes—but now

overpowered by death.—But I proclaim a power that is greater than death—I am not ashamed of the Gospel, for it is a power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth."—Paul's message was one of Life—He testified of Him who is the Resurrection and the Life,—and who is stronger than death.

II.—Note the Condition of that Power

It is a law of life that we must comply with conditions, if success shall be ours. Take, for example, electricity. It lights our homes, drives our engines, transports us from place to place,—if all conditions are met. But let the wires be cut, and all machinery becomes lifeless. Thus it is also with the Spiritual. Let the conditions be met as laid down by the Author of Law and Order, and God can flash forth light, power and salvation. But disconnect your communication with God, and the mighty power surging overhead becomes as if it were not.

What are the means which bring this Divine Power to us? (1) Prayer—(2) Worship—(3) Bible Reading and Meditation—(4) Exercising of faith, hope and love.

With this Gospel-power in you, there is no burden that you cannot carry; no task that you cannot do; no enemy that you cannot overcome. Earnestly seek this power! Zealously keep it when found!

October 9

Safety Sunday

(The pastor may choose any Sunday as Safety Sunday. The necessity of stressing preservation of life and limb is obvious.)

Subject: *"The Value of a Life."*

Text: Matt. 6: 25b: "Is not the life more than the food, and the body than the raiment?"

Why should the Church be interested in Safety? Because the Church is interested (1) in human welfare; (2) because accidents take eighty-five thousand lives per year in the United States; (3) because Safety means right living.

The Safety movement is a splendid example of applied Christianity. Safety Sunday is sensible and Scriptural.

I.—The Value of a Life

The Christian Church has always tried to show how valuable and sacred life is. Human bodies are not temples of brute strength, but of the Holy Spirit. Life is to be protected, developed, and saved for its best and holiest expression. It has value to (1) God; (2) to the family; (3) to society; (4) to the individual.

II.—Life Must Be Carefully Conserved

Accidents are a more prolific cause of suffering and of death than is war. During the nineteen months in which the United States was engaged in the World War, the total mortality among our soldiers from all causes was 77,101. During the same nineteen months, 136,000 lost their lives through accidental means, while engaged in the pursuits of peace.

There is coming a time when the conservation of life will be more stressed than the conservation of forests, or fields or fortunes; when municipalities, states and nations will dedicate their biggest brains and their bravest hearts to the preserving of life.

II.—Facts and Figures in the Accident Situation

Street and highway fatalities, 24,000. Grade crossing fatalities, 2,200. Street car fatalities, 2,000. Automobile fatalities, 21,000. Industrial fatalities, 23,000. Home fatalities, 20,000. Fatalities, children under 15—21,300. Personal injuries, non-fatal, per year: street and highway, 720,000; industrial, 3,000,000. Economic cost of accidents, per year: street and highway accidents: $600,000,000; industrial accidents, $1,000,000,000.

IV.—The Effort to Save Life Should Be Organized

Industries, schools, traffic, officials, citizens, clubs, churches should unite in saving life and promoting happiness. Education necessary. We are our brothers' keepers. "None of us liveth unto himself and no one dieth unto himself." Better to save life and prevent accidents than to build and sustain hospitals.

Let every Christian citizen co-operate in this great community work.

October 16

Topic: *"October Days and Birds of Passage."*

Text: "Yea, the stork in the heaven knoweth her appointed times; and the turtle (dove) and the crane and the swallow observe the time of their coming; but my people know not the judgment of the Lord." Jeremiah 8: 7.

The October days bring to our attention the passage of birds. Some in groups, some in solitary flight wend their way to brighter climes. What guides them? Is it vision?—knowledge?—experienced leaders?—instinct? Prof. Newton of Cambridge, says: "In the migration of birds we are brought face to face with the greatest mystery in the animal kingdom." In these October days the Birds of Passage impress upon our heart great lessons.

I.—The Home Instinct

Man is in a "far country". In vain he seeks security, peace and true happiness. There is no rest, except in God,—in the re-

turn to Him, and in the abiding in Him." Return unto thy rest, O my soul"—Ps. 116: 7. "We came forth from God and we are homesick until we return" (Augustine). The thought of a better home, stimulates to heavenward flight.

II.—The Homeward Way

If God provides the chart for the birds, will He do less for His children? The prophet declares: "A highway shall be there . . . and it shall be called the way of holiness" (Isa. 35: 8). But a greater than Isaiah says of Himself: "I am the Way"—John 10: 6—And again in John 14: 2: "In my Father's House are many mansions—I go to prepare a place for you." Thus in Christ God has provided the homeward way.

III.—The Opposing Forces

For the birds of passage—winds and storms,—the fowler's snare, the hunter's weapon, the birds of prey. Contrary forces for man homeward bound,—forces that buffet, impede, harm, destroy: Such are temptations, trials, losses, misfortunes. Forces not only from without, but also from within: the imaginations of man's heart (Gen. 8: 21); the refractory will. Birds may rise above the head-winds. Shall man be less wise and strong?

IV.—God's Guiding Love

"He who, from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone
Will lead my steps aright." (Bryant)

Trust God—be not afraid.

Our prayer:

Lead, kindly Light, amid th'encircling gloom,
Lead Thou me on,
The night is dark, and I am far from Home,
Lead Thou me on—".

There will come the time when "with the morn those angel faces smile," and God's love shall welcome his wandering child to peace and rest and Home.

October 23

Topic: *October Days and the Fading Leaf.*

Text: "We all do fade as a leaf". . . Isaiah 64: 6.

October days bring to our attention the fading leaf. Of what should it remind us?

I.—The Flight of Time

How quickly the days have gone by: Spring, Summer and now Autumn. Thus the days, the opportunities, the strength and

beauty of life rush by. "Our days are swifter than a weaver's shuttle." "A flower of the field—". The fading leaf admonishes us to improve the time. Is there any good you ought to do? Any wrong, any grudge, any sin to wipe out? Do not delay. Rapid is the flight of time. Tomorrow may be too late.

### II.—Beautiful Old Age

The fading leaf in all its wonderful coloring, would remind us of the duty of growing old beautifully and gracefully. Life's beauty is not confined to its Springtime or Summertime. It may be extended to the Autumn of life. Old age can be beautiful, and old age can be useful. Cite examples of persons who have done great things in the Autumn of Life: Milton who wrote "Paradise Lost," when old and blind; Herschel who discovered the planet Uranus in his old age (60); Gladstone, Bismarck,—who were towers of strength for their people; Dr. Johnson's best work: "The Lives of the Poets," written when he was seventy-eight; Humboldt completed his "Cosmos" at ninety; Goldsmith was a plant that flowered late in life"; Galileo was nearly seventy when he wrote on the laws of motion; Newton wrote new briefs to his "Principia" at eighty-three; Dandolo, Doge of Venice, won battles at ninety-four, and refused a crown at ninety-six. Behold also beautiful old age in the persons of Simeon and Anna in the Temple; John, the writer of the Book of Revelation.

### III.—Our Mortality

The fading leaf would remind us of the sureness of death. No escape. "The black camel kneels at every gate." But death a divine arrangement. The leaf falls because it is ripe and complete. No life incomplete. God makes no mistakes. Trust His wisdom and love.

### IV.—Our Immortality

The fading leaf leaves its record on the tree where it lived. Each life leaves a record behind. The influence may go on for many years,—good or bad.—For the Christian, death is only transition. The earthly tenement falls into decay,—the spiritual tenant lives on in the mansions of the blest.

### V.—Our Twofold Nature

For its frame-work the leaf receives from the earth the necessary silica. All else comes from the air and sun. Thus we receive from the earth that which is earthy—but our real life comes from God,—the light and breath of our life. The *frame-work,* the body, departs,—goes back to the earth; the *real life,* the soul, goes back to God, where there is no chilling and killing wind of death.

October 30

Reformation Sunday

Topic: *The Church of the Reformation.*

Texts: Matt. 28: 20—Rev. 3: 11; Phil. 4: 13.

During the dark days of the Middle Ages, God was working in the minds and hearts of men. First, there was an *intellectual revolt* against the tyranny of Church and state,—the Renaissance. Men cut loose from confining moorings and set sail for new shores of exploration and discovery.—Secondly, there was a *religious revolt.* Under the leadership of Dr. Martin Luther men cast aside fallible human mediators and sought direct approach to God through the One Mediator, Jesus Christ. The result of this two-fold revolt was: *The Church of the Reformation.*

I.

The Church of the Reformation has a *divine promise.* What is this promise? "I am with you alway, etc." Matt. 28: 20.

That glorious promise held good *then.* In times of storm and stress, such as the Peasants' War, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's, the Thirty Years' War, periods of terrible persecution.

That glorious promise holds good *now,* as the Church faces under new guise the old sins and enemies of worldliness and indifference—the menace of worldly, money grabbing churchery;—the sinister power of paganism, restless and assertive.

That glorious promise will hold good for the *future.* No matter what changes occur in the political and social fields, no matter what may befall the world,—the promises of God are Yea in Him and Amen in Him.

II.

The Church of the Reformation has *an earnest admonition.* What is this admonition? We find it written: Rev. 3: 11: "Hold that fast which thou hast, etc."

It is an admonition to *watchfulness and work,* that the *blessings* of the Reformation may not be lost. What are some of these blessings? 1. The Open Bible; 2. Direct access to the throne of Grace; 3. The Sacraments in their Evangelical form; 4. The rich treasure of Congregational hymns.

There is such a thing as *unconscious deterioration,*—Christians losing unconsciously their first love, their first earnestness. Let us therefore heed the earnest admonition: "Hold that fast, etc."

III.

The Church of the Reformation has *unlimited possibilities.* What are these possibilities? The Apostle makes mention of them in Phil. 4: 13: "I can do all things through Christ, etc."

The possibilities of the Church are as limitless as the love and power of God! Note the possibility for *work* in Home and Foreign Mission fields. Note the possibility for *holiness*. The Church purged of every stain. Note the possibility for *victory*. No matter how discouraging the outlook, or arduous the task, or insurmountable the obstacles, or fierce the onslaught of battle,—victory, glorious victory shall be hers. That victory will involve at last for the Church of the Reformation a wonderful *transformation* from darkness to light, from sorrow to bliss, from death to eternal life.

Let that glorious vision of victory be our inspiration to pray more ardently and to work more faithfully.

# Die Betätigung des christlichen Charakters in der Geschlechtsgemeinschaft.

Von Prof. Dr. R. H. Grützmacher.

## I.

### Die Unterscheidung der Geschlechter.

Zu der Betätigung des christlichen Charakters gegenüber der eigenen Persönlichkeit und derjenigen gegenüber Gott und der Kirche tritt seine Wirksamkeit in der Welt. Diese vollzieht sich in vier großen Sozialformen, der Geschlechtsgemeinschaft und der aus ihr erwachsenden Familie, der Kulturgemeinschaft, der Wirtschafts- und Rechtsgemeinschaft. Wir behandeln die an erster Stelle genannte Gemeinschaftsform in zwei Artikeln: I. **Die Unterscheidung der Geschlechter.** II. **Die Verbindung der Geschlechter in der Ehe.**

Die elementarste soziale Verbindung der Menschen untereinander ruht auf dem Geschlechtstrieb. Während sich die niedrigsten einzelligen Lebewesen durch einfache Teilung vermehren, finden wir die geschlechtliche Zeugung bei den höheren Tieren und den Menschen. Die Gattung Mensch zerfällt infolgedessen in zwei Geschlechter, das männliche und weibliche, von denen jedes Träger einer aus Protoplasma und Kern bestehenden Keimzelle ist. Nur aus dieser Verbindung erwächst die Möglichkeit der Entstehung neuen Lebens und damit der Fortsetzung der Gattung. Die Natur hat Mann und Weib ebenso voneinander unterschieden, wie auf ihre Vereinigung angelegt. Daraus ergibt sich auch unter sittlichem Gesichtspunkt die Aufgabe, einmal die Unterschiede der Geschlechter festzustellen und dann von ihrer Verbindung in der Ehe zu handeln. Bei der Unterscheidung ist von den Unterschieden in der geschlechtlichen Anlage auszugehen. Denn diese wurzelt nicht nur in entsprechenden leiblichen Organen und Vorgängen, sondern reicht auch in die geistige Wesenheit des Menschen hinein. Ein älterer Aesthetiker veranschaulichte diesen Tatbestand einmal in dem Bild: die Liebe ist ein Baum, der seine Wurzel im Körperlichen hat, seine Aeste aber hoch über der körperlichen Welt in der Sphäre des Geistigen immer mehr ausbreitet, immer reicher verzweigt. Damit ist im Grund nichts anders gesagt, als was schon die biblische Schöpfungsgeschichte behauptet, daß Gott den Menschen in seinem ganzen leiblich geistigen Wesen als Mann und Frau geschaffen und füreinander bestimmt habe — eine Anschauung, die auch im Neuen Testament und in der Reformation die feste natürliche Basis für die ethische Anschauung bleibt. Die hauptsächlichsten Unterschiede des Menschen knüpfen an seine verschiedene Geschlechtlichkeit an. Nach den Formeln eines bekannten Forschers, Forel, ist „die Natur des Man-

nes aggressiv, progressiv, variabel — die der Frau rezeptiv, reizempfänglicher, einförmiger." Der ganze Charakter des Mannes drängt zur Aktivität, er sucht sich nicht nur die Frau, sondern die gesamte Natur und auch die ihn umgebende geschichtliche Umwelt zu unterwerfen. Das kann mehr leiblich durch seine überlegene körperliche Kraft oder mehr geistig durch seinen Verstand und Willen geschehen. Legt man die Unterscheidung dreier Seelenvermögen, Denken, Fühlen, Wollen zu Grund, so wird man Denken und Wollen in besonderer Extensität und Intensität dem männlichen Wesen zuschreiben. Diese aber gehen in Produktivität über. Die geistige Betätigung des Mannes im Denken schafft neue Ideen, im Wollen unbekannte Ideale. Diese vorzugsweise Produktivität des Mannes wird durch die Geschichte bestätigt. **Auf wissenschaftlichem, künstlerischem, aber gerade auch auf religiösem Gebiet gehen die bedeutendsten Schöpfungen auf Männer zurück.** Ein Gelehrter, der sich ganz besonders eingehend mit der Psychologie der Geschlechter beschäftigt hat, Havelock Ellis, weist darauf hin, daß von allen großen religiösen Bewegungen der Welt 99 unter 100 ihren ersten Impuls von Männern erhalten haben und fügt dem hinzu: „Dagegen waren es die Frauen, die immer bereit waren, sich den Religionsstiftern anzuschließen." In der Tat sind alle großen Religionen von Männern gestiftet, man denke an Zarathustra und Buddha, Muhammed und Jesus. Auch innerhalb der Kirche sind Männer, wie Paulus, Augustin, Luther, Calvin, die treibenden Faktoren gewesen. Aehnliche Ergebnisse würde eine Durchwanderung der Philosophie und — wenn auch in etwas geringerem Grad — die der Kunstgeschichte ergeben. Diese Beobachtungen können nicht allein in der lange Zeit währenden Absperrung der Frau vom höheren geistigen Leben ihre Wurzel haben, sondern müssen positiv in der natürlichen Anlage des Mannes auf Aktivität und Produktivität begründet sein. Produktives Denken und Wollen richtet sich seinem Wesen nach auf das Objektive und Allgemeine; es löst sich vom Subjekt und dessen konkreten und begrenzten Zielen. Infolgedessen ist das männliche Denken in seiner Form logisch-sachlich, in seinem Inhalt auf objektive Größen gerichtet. Das Wollen umfaßt über das persönliche Interesse hinausgehende Ziele. Damit ist aber weiter eine große Beweglichkeit und Mannigfaltigkeit für den Mann gegeben, der immer neue Gedanken und wechselnde Ziele ergreift. Beweglichkeit und Werden, die des Mannes Wesen charakterisieren, sind aber zugleich Hauptmerkmale der Geschichte. Infolgedessen kann man sagen, daß **der Mann spezifisch für die Geschichte d. h. für einen fortlaufenden Prozeß geistiger Schöpfungen begabt und berufen sei.**

In all diesen Richtungen unterscheidet sich die Frau. Sie ist

schon rein physisch die Aufnehmende, empfängt und trägt lange das neue Leben in ihrem Innern. Diese Rezeptivität wirkt auch auf das geistige Leben hinüber im Sinn der Empfänglichkeit, des Behaltens, Beharrens und Verarbeitens. Rezeptivität ist durchaus nicht stumpfe Passivität; sie ist auch eine Form der Lebendigkeit, die nur ihren Anstoß und Grundgehalt nicht aus sich, sondern anderswoher empfangen hat. Wie die Bildung des Kindes und dann seine Geburt einen starken Zuschuß eigenen Lebens und eine Leistung großer Kraft in sich schließt, so gehört zur weiblichen Rezeptivität auch eine beträchtliche geistige Leistung des Verstehens, der Vertiefung, der Umgestaltung und Ausmünzung geistiger Werte. Diese kann öfters so stark sein, daß sie fast den Charakter reiner Produktivität gewinnt. Darum hat auch der weibliche Geist seinen Anteil an der Geschichte des geistigen Lebens, und es fehlt ihm durchaus nicht jede natürliche Anlage — besonders wenn gewisse kulturelle Hemmungen seiner Ausbildung gefallen sind — zur Mitarbeit in Wissenschaft, Kunst und Religion. Nur pflegt diese nicht in erster Linie den Charakter völlig neuer Entdeckungen zu tragen, sondern in deren Verarbeitung, Vertiefung und Bewertung zu liegen.

Diese letzte Funktion setzt ein Wirksamwerden der dritten psychologischen Fähigkeiten, des Fühlens, voraus. Sowenig der Frau Denken und Wollen fehlt — wie auf der andern Seite der Mann nicht ohne Fühlen ist —, so ist **die spezifisch weibliche Funktion doch die des Fühlens oder des Gemütes,** das durchaus nicht mit sentimentalen und weichlichen Stimmungen verbunden zu sein braucht. Das ganze Empfindungsleben der Frau ist stark durch die Mutterschaft und deren Dauer bestimmt, die sich in entsprechenden Lust- und Unlustempfindungen reflektiert. Darum ist es naturgemäß, daß die Frau diese Seiten ihres inneren Lebens auch zum begleitenden Akkord ihrer geistigen Funktion macht. Sie bewertet auch Ideen und Willensziele nach der Gefühlsresonanz, die sie hervorrufen, nach dem inneren seelischen Echo, das sie wecken. **Damit kommt ein subjektiver und persönlicher Zug in das Geistesleben der Frau hinein.** Sie konzentriert sich nicht auf objektive und ferne Ziele, denen jede Verbindungslinie zu ihrem persönlichen Leben fehlt. Alle Theorie erscheint ihr darum grau. Sie sucht den Menschen und den Dingen stets eine subjektive Note abzugewinnen und richtet ihre Aufmerksamkeit, Liebe aber auch Haß mehr auf einzelne konkrete Persönlichkeiten, als auf abstrakte Ideen und Ideale. Durch dieses Vorwiegen des Gefühlselementes kommt eine starke Beweglichkeit auch in das Leben der Frau, denn zum Wesen des Gefühls gehört der rasche Wechsel. Bei dieser Sachlage scheint die Frau viel eher als der Mann

den Typus der Beweglichkeit zu repräsentieren. Allein ihr Gefühlsleben beschäftigt sich mit viel begrenzteren und häufig wiederkehrenderen Erlebnissen, als der männliche Geist. Dazu hat die Frau die Neigung einmal in ihr inneres Wesen leiblich oder geistig aufgenommene Elemente zu behalten und treu zu bewahren. Auf eine abschließende Formel gebracht, darf man behaupten: **die Frau steht der ruhenden und dauernden Natur besonders nahe.**

Sind damit die hauptsächlichsten Unterschiede von Mann und Weib gezeichnet, so leuchten aus diesem empirischen Tatbestand sittliche Ideen und Normen als Grundsätze für die Sexualethik auf. **Erste sittliche Forderung ist die Anerkennung und Aufrechterhaltung der sinnlich-geistigen Differenz zwischen Mann und Weib.** Sie schließt ein Doppeltes in sich: einmal die Anerkennung der geschlechtlichen Unterschiedenheit überhaupt als eines zu bejahenden Wertes und sodann der natürlichen Ungleichartigkeit, aber ethischen Gleichwertigkeit von Mann und Frau. Wäre die Sexualität nur eine rein sinnliche Erscheinung, die etwa gar nur in bestimmten physischen Akten zur Auswirkung käme, dann wäre es möglich, sie auszuschalten oder mit einem ethischen Minus zu verbinden. Ist aber der Mensch als Ganzer von Gott schon im Paradies als Mann und Weib geschaffen, so kann man ihn nur als solchen anerkennen. Auch wenn jemand Mönch oder Nonne wird, bleibt er doch geistleiblich Mann oder Weib. Denn auch das Denken eines Mönches behält die männlichen Charakterzüge und auch eine Nonne dient ihrem Gott wie den Menschen in spezifisch weiblicher Weise. Nur eine schlechthin natur- und schöpfungsfeindliche Ethik, die zu einem völlig negativen Endresultat führen will, wie die buddhistische, kann sich den Geschlechtsunterschieden gegenüber feindlich stellen oder sie zu ignorieren versuchen. Aber auch jede Form einer dualistischen Ethik, die eine Beseitigung der Geschlechtlichkeit durch Tötung oder Kasteiung der Leiblichkeit erreichen will, rechnet mit einer falschen Teilbarkeit der Natur. Sie hält Leib und Geist für ganz geschiedene Provinzen, während in Wirklichkeit beide unter der Bestimmtheit der Geschlechter stehen. **Infolgedessen bleibt nur die ethische Haltung übrig, welche in den Geschlechtern eine von Gott gewollte und darum zu ehrende Anlage sieht. Das ist die Einstellung der urchristlich-reformatorischen Ethik.** Jesus rechnet mit vollkommener Selbstverständlichkeit mit der Tatsache, daß nach Gottes Schöpfungsordnung Mann und Weib vorhanden sind und daß zwischen ihnen der stärkste Trieb der Anziehung in jeder Form waltet. Antwortet er doch Matth. 19, 4 den Pharisäern: „Habt ihr nicht gelesen, daß, der im Anfang den Menschen gemacht hat, der machte,

daß ein Mann und Weib sein sollte. Und er sprach: Darum wird ein Mensch Vater und Mutter verlassen und an seinem Weib hangen und werden die zwei ein Fleisch sein." Mit derselben Natürlichkeit, ja mit einer gewissen Freudigkeit bejaht Luther das Vorhandensein und die Verbindung der beiden Geschlechter als naturgegeben und ethisch wertvoll: „All' so wenig als es in meiner Macht steht, daß ich kein Mannsbild sei, all' so wenig steht es auch bei mir, daß ich ohne Weib sei."

Aus der empirisch festgestellten Differenz von Mann und Weib ergibt sich als weitere ethische Forderung, gerade **diese Unterschiede als Werte anzuerkennen,** die nicht verlorengehen, ja nicht einmal verkürzt werden dürfen. Diese unethische Tendenz kann sich sowohl in **der Verachtung eines der beiden Geschlechter** auswirken, wie auch in dem **Versuch ihrer völligen Gleichmachung** oder mindestens starken Verähnlichung. Die erstere läßt sich besonders in der Antike, die letztere mehr in der Gegenwart beobachten. Die orientalische und okzidentalische Antike — trotz einer Reihe von Ausnahmen in Griechenland und Rom —, die starke Nachwirkungen im Mohammedanismus hinterließ, hat das Weib dem Mann entschieden untergeordnet und in ihm ein minderwertiges Geschlechtswesen gesehen, das nur zur Erzeugung der Nachkommenschaft diente. Noch Rabbi Meir im 2. Jahrhundert nach Christi dankt täglich dafür, daß Gott ihn nicht zum Heiden, nicht zum ungebildeten Menschen und nicht zum Weib geschaffen habe. — Das Christentum hat durchaus nicht mit einer Reform der Stellung der Frau im äußeren, weltlichen und sozialen Leben eingesetzt. In dieser Hinsicht beobachten wir vielmehr, sonderlich bei Paulus, einen Anschluß an die damaligen Sitten, wie in der Aufrechterhaltung des Gebotes der Verschleierung und des Verbotes eines Auftretens in öffentlicher religiösen Versammlung. Der verstorbene Erlanger Kirchenhistoriker Jordan stellte mit Recht fest: „So ist auch die Stellung der Frau in der ältesten Christenheit in sozialer, rechtlicher, ja gesellschaftlicher Stellung vielfach nur eine Fortführung der Stellung, die sie in der antiken, jüdisch-griechisch römischen Welt inne hatte." **Dagegen hat das Christentum** — seinem innersten Wesen entsprechend — **mit einer entschiedenen und rückhaltlosen Gleichstellung der Frau in der religiösen Sphäre eingesetzt.** Während Buddha nur widerwillig und auf starken Druck seiner Mutter die Bildung einer Frauengemeinschaft zuließ, die trotzdem aber noch als minderwertig angesehen wurde, finden wir im Gefolge Jesu von Anbeginn auch Frauen und nirgends ist die leiseste Spur zu bemerken, daß ihnen nicht das Reich Gottes in gleicher Weise bestimmt sei. Ja Jesus hat sogar den Frauen, die sich bis dahin als reine Geschlechtswesen gefühlt hatten und als solche mißbraucht wa-

ren, eine besondere Güte bezeugt und sogar mit kühner Paradoxie sie — allerdings unter Voraussetzung ihrer Bußfertigkeit — als dem Himmelreich besonders nahestehend bezeichnet. Genau so beurteilt Paulus die religiöse Stellung der Frau, wenn er sagt: „Hier ist nicht Jude noch Grieche, nicht Knecht noch Freier, nicht Mann noch Weib; denn ihr seit allzumal Einer in Christo Jesu." (Gal. 3.) Prinzipiell ergibt sich darum: „Das Christentum ist nicht Staatsreligion und als solches im Wesentlichen Mannesreligion, sondern Menschheits- und zugleich Individualreligion. Damit aber ist von vornherein für das Christentum auch der Gegensatz zwischen Mann und Frau hinsichtlich der Religion fortgefallen." (Jordan.) — Im Katholizismus ist die Nonne dem Mönch religiös gleichgestellt; im Marienkultus zeigt sich sogar eine gewisse Neigung für eine Höherwertigkeit der Frau. War dagegen die Reformation ein durchaus männliches Zeitalter, so hat doch auch sie der Frau den gleichen Anteil an allen religiösen Gütern, auch am allgemeinen Priestertum, gewährt.

**Aus dieser religiös-christlichen Hebung ist allmählich auch die immer völligere Gleichstellung der Frau auf den verschiedensten menschlichen Gebieten als Tatsache und Ideal erwachsen.** Zu dieser Entwicklung haben außer dem Christentum auch andre Mächte beigetragen. Das Ich- und Individualitätsbewußtsein der Renaissance, die naturrechtliche Anschauung von der natürlichen Gleichheit aller Menschen im 18. Jahrhundert; das tiefre Verständnis der Frau bei den großen Dichtern, der Kultus des Weibes in der Romantik — alle diese Bewegungen haben gewiß zu der Erringung der Stellung mitgeholfen, welche die Frau in der modernen Zeit einnimmt. Aber es würde der geschichtlichen Wahrheit widersprechen, wenn man hier die hohe Bedeutung des Christentums unterschätzen oder ihm gar ein gegenteilige Wirkung zuschreiben wollte. Neuere Sozialisten wie Bebel in seinem außerordentlich verbreiteten Buch „Die Frau und der Sozialismus" haben behauptet: „Das Christentum predigte die Verachtung der Frau. Es ist gänzlich unschuldig, wenn heute die Stellung der Frau eine höhere ist als zur Zeit seiner Entstehung." Ein andrer Schriftsteller geht noch ein Stück weiter, wenn er im Hinblick auf die alttestamentliche Erzählung vom Sündenfall behauptet: „Die eigentliche Urquelle des modernen Weiberhasses ist das Christentum, die christliche Lehre von der ursprünglich bösen, sündhaften, teuflischen Natur des Weibes." Liest man aber bei diesem Literaten — Iwan Bloch — weiter nach, so muß er selbst für die moderne Weiberfeindschaft ganz andre Ursachen feststellen: „Sie ist doch vielmehr eine Sache der Uebersättigung oder Enttäuschung, als des Glaubens und der Ueberzeugung, die dann trotz aller Ausartung im christlichen Mit-

telalter die wirksamsten ursächlichen Faktoren der Misogynie waren." Bloch nennt als solche Vertreter der **Nichtachtung der Frau aus moderner Zeit** de Sade, Schopenhauer, Tolstoi, Weininger, Strindberg, Möbius. Bei diesen Männern finden sich alle möglichen physiologischen und psychologischen Argumente zur Diskreditierung der Frau aufgeführt. Möbius spricht schon im Titel seines Werkes von ihrem „Physiologischen Schwachsinn"; bei Weininger in dem Werk: Geschlecht und Charakter ist der Grundgedanke der, die Frau sei nur Sinnen- und Geschlechtswesen und jeder geistigen Ergebung unfähig. Verfolgt man aber genauer das Leben und die Erfahrungen dieser Männer besonders bei einem Schopenhauer und Strindberg, so wird man dem Urteil Blochs zustimmen: „Nur die Männer, die dem Weib nicht gewachsen sind, nur diese sind die echten Weiberhasser." Steht es aber so, dann **besteht kein Anlaß** auf Grund der individuellen Erfahrung einzelner Männer **die natürlich-sittliche, vom Christentum bestätigte und gepflegte, in der modernen Zeit weiterentwickelte Gleichwertigkeit der Frau aufzugeben.**

**Diese Gleichwertigkeit der Frau ist nicht identisch mit einer Gleichartigkeit zwischen Mann und Frau.** Von Seiten einzelner Männer, mehr aber noch von einer Ende des 19., Anfangs des 20. Jahrhunderts einsetzenden Frauenbewegung ist die Parole ausgegeben worden: möglichste Annäherung der Frau an den Mann. Die Männer wollen sich die Frau nicht mehr als Weib, sondern nur noch als Kameraden gefallen lassen, sie soll die Aufgabe der Mutterschaft nicht mehr erfüllen und sich möglichst den Funktionen des Mannes nähern. Die Frauenbewegung verlangt die völlige Gleichstellung der Frau und ihre Ausstattung mit allen Rechten des Mannes. Man geht von der Voraussetzung aus, daß die Frau völlig Gleiches leisten könne und erklärt die bisherigen Unterschiede nur durch die geschichtliche Absperrung und Einsperrung der Frau in langen Jahrhunderten. Von Natur identifiziert man im Grund die Frau mit dem Mann. Unsre Analyse der geschlechtlichen Unterschiede schließt durchaus nicht eine noch weiter als bisher gehende Heranziehung der Frau auch zur praktischen, künstlerischen und wissenschaftlichen Mitarbeit aus; aber schon diese wird durchschnittlich eine andre Form und zwar eine mehr rezeptive gegenüber den produktiven des Mannes annehmen. **Ablehnen müssen wir dagegen den Gedanken der vollen Vermännlichung der Frau als eines sittlichen Ideales und Fortschrittes.** Es gibt Gebiete, auf denen die Frau nicht dieselben Leistungen vollbringen kann, wie der Mann. Am deutlichsten zeigt sich das im Krieg. In die Instanzen, die über Krieg und Frieden zu entscheiden haben, wie in die oberste Heeresleitung, gehört darum die Frau nicht hinein. In einer solchen

Feststellung liegt nicht die mindeste Herabsetzung der Frau, denn gerade die Kriegszeit hat bewiesen, daß die Frau zwar nicht gleichartige, wohl aber gleichwertige sittliche Leistungen aufzuweisen hat, wie die Pflege der Verwundeten, das wirtschaftliche Durchhalten, die Erziehung der Jugend. **Die Frau leistet im Ganzen der Menschheit wie der Familie, Kultur, Wirtschaft, Volk unumgänglich wichtige Dienste, aber in den Formen, die ihrer Natur entsprechen.** Wir stimmen darum Bloch zu, wenn er sagt: „Alle Versuche der Kultur und Natur den Unterschied zwischen dem spezifisch Männlichen und dem spezifisch Weiblichen zu verwischen, müssen als aussichtslos und dem Fortschritt der Entwicklung hemmend angesehen werden."

**Die Erweiterung der Betätigung der Frau in der Gegenwart kann von der christlichen Ethik nicht allgemeingültig negativ oder positiv festgelegt werden.** Das darf auch nicht durch Berufung auf mißverstandene Bibelworte geschehen. In 1. Kor. 14, 34 lesen wir: „Die Frauen sollen in den Gemeinden schweigen; denn es ist ihnen nicht erlaubt zu reden, sondern sie sollen untertan sein, wenn sie aber etwas lernen wollen, sollen sie zu Hause ihre eigenen Männer fragen." In diesem Paulusworte handelt es sich einmal nur um das Auftreten der Frau in den offiziellen religiösen Gemeindeversammlungen. Sodann redet es von verheirateten Frauen, die zu Hause die Möglichkeit haben, von ihren Männern religiöse Unterweisung zu empfangen. Aus diesem Verbot ist schlechterdings nichts zur Entscheidung der Frage zu entnehmen, welche Berufe — besonders die unverheiratete — Frau in der Gegenwart ergreifen darf; es ist nicht einmal etwas gegen ihr Auftreten in außerreligiöser Oeffentlichkeit gesagt. In einer andern Stelle derselben Schrift 1. Kor. 11, 5 erwähnt Paulus sogar eine in öffentlicher Kultusversammlung redende und prophezeiende Frau. Er schließt darnach auch eine religiös hervortretende Aktivität einer dazu besonders veranlagten Frau nicht aus und verlangt nur, daß sie dabei die Formen der Sitte — damals die der Verschleierung — nicht vernachlässigt. Schon in der ältesten Christenheit begegnen wir der Forderung, daß unverheiratete oder verwitwete Frauen Berufe im Dienst der ganzen Gemeinde übernehmen. Ausführlichere Anweisungen enthalten die Pastoralbriefe. **Die christliche Ethik hat darum die Forderung zu vertreten, daß auch jede Frau um ihrer selbst wie um der Gemeinschaft Willen einen bestimmten Beruf ergreife; wenn sie nicht den der Gattin und Mutter ausfüllen kann.** Der Erlanger Systematiker Frank sagte darum schon: „Es ist von hohem, nicht bloß sozialpolitischen, sondern auch ethischen Wert, dem weiblichen Geschlecht, welches ja am meisten in die Lage gezwungener Ehelosigkeit versetzt wird, Berufswege zu eröffnen,

auf denen die Verwertung der ihnen eigentümlichen Gaben möglich ist." Praxis und geschichtliche Entwicklung haben hier im Einzelnen Maß und Art der Berufsbetätigung für die Frau zu bestimmen. Für die christliche Ethik genügt es, die Forderung als berechtigt anzuerkennen.

# Philosophische und theologische Strömungen des 18., 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts, in kurzzusammengefaßter Darlegung.

Von Pastor Carl Hartwig.

„Wir sind ein Volk vom Strom der Zeit gespült ans Erdeneiland, voll Unfall und voll Herzeleid, bis heim uns holt der Heiland."

Dieser Vers unsrer Dichterin offenbart uns den Gang unsers Lebensschiffes. Aber wir sind nicht in Furcht, uns ist nicht bange, wir verzagen nicht, denn wir haben einen Steuermann, auf den wir felsenfest vertrauen können, mit Hilfe dessen wir allen Strömungen, die uns von der einen zur anderen Seite reißen wollen, trotzen können. Damit wir aber nicht an einer Gefahr vorbei gehen oder sogar hineingeraten, so ist es gut, sie zu kennen um aus ihnen zu lernen.

Möchten nachfolgende Ausführungen uns einen kurzen Ueberblick geben von den wichtigsten Strömungen philosophischer und theologischer Art: Wir beginnen mit Immanuel Kant.

Mit dem Auftreten Kants trat auf dem Gebiet der Theologie und Philosophie ein großer Umschwung ein. Schon in kleineren Schriften hatte er Anläufe zu seinem Standpunkt genommen, als im Jahre 1781 sein epochemachendes Hauptwerk „die Kritik der reinen Vernunft" erschien. Teils begeistert, teils sehr kritisch wurde seine Philosophie aufgenommen, und von Männern wie Herder wurde der einseitige Einfluß der Kantschen Philosophie auf die Theologie mit klarem Geist erkannt. Aber die Zeit ward eine rationalistische, von spekulativen und tieferem religiösem Gehalt entleerte, einseitig moralische.

Erst mit Fichtes Idealismus, Schellings Lehre vom Absolutem und Hegels Lehre vom Immanenten Geist wurden die tieferen Lebensfragen des Christentums wieder zu spekulativen Fragen der Philosophie.

Auch **Schleiermacher,** der gewandteste Dialektiker seiner Zeit, war keineswegs der tieferen Spekulation abhold. Doch wollte er Philosophie und Theologie auseinander gehalten wissen. Nach ihm sollte die Theologie ebensowenig in der Spekulation aufgehen wie die Religion, die für ihn Sache des Gefühls war, im Denken. Oft hatte man sich gestritten welche Theologen die Tüchtigeren seien: Ein Theologe aus der Kantschen Schule konnte vielleicht eine tüchtigere Erkenntnis an den Tag legen, als einer aus der Hegelschen,

mochte sie auch vom philosophischen Standpunkt die bessere sein.

Wir als biblische Theologen müssen allerdings eine Philosophie die Gott vernichtet, den Geist und die sittliche Freiheit leugnet, selbstverständlich verwerfen. Wir halten uns an die Bibel als an das inspirierte Wort Gottes.

Wir wissen, daß die Bibel überall einen Dualismus von Gott und Welt, Himmel und Erde, Geist und Fleisch usw. voraussetzt. Dieser ist freilich nicht als ein starrer und unüberwindlicher zu verstehen, sondern als ein durch die Macht des Christentums noch zu überwindender Gegensatz.

Mithin entspringen hieraus zwei Richtungen: Die eine faßt die Gegensätze in vollkommener Beziehungslosigkeit, die andre vernichtet dieselben, statt sie durch die Macht des Gedankens zu vermitteln. Die erstere ist die „deistische," die zweite die „pantheistische" Richtung. Gegen die erstere, die „deistische," hatte die frühere Zeit zu kämpfen, der letzteren müssen sich die Theologen teils auch heute noch erwehren.

Der „Deismus" ist eine Weltanschauung, nach der Gott und Welt nicht nur unterschieden, sondern auch geschieden sind. Nach ihr gibt es nur einen jenseitigen, überweltlichen Gott, der die Welt geschaffen hat, sie aber nun ihrem einmal geordnetem Gang überläßt. Dieser Gott trit zu dem Menschen in keine lebendige Beziehung. Er steht zwar als Gesetzgeber und Richter gegenüber, teilt sich aber dem Menschen nicht mit. Wie aber der „Deismus" Gott und Welt trennt, so bringt er auch Seele und Leib in keinerlei Beziehung. Die Natur ist ihm eine lebendige Maschine. Diese Weltanschauung leugnet die Macht der Triebe auf der einen, und den lebendigen, geistigen Zusammenhang mit Gott auf der anderen Seite. Daher begreift sie auch weder das Wesen der Sünde, noch das der Erlösung und der Gnade, das Geheimnis der religiösen Gemeinschaft, die Bedeutung des Gebets und der Sakramente.

Ihr gegenüber hat die zweite Richtung, „die pantheistische," viel Anziehendes auf Gemüt und Phantasie, vermag aber das Gemüt auf die Dauer nicht zu befriedigen, denn sie sieht entweder Gott in der Welt und fällt in den Materialismus, oder sie läßt die Welt untergehen in Gott und wird idealistisch. Sie setzt Gott und Wirklichkeit gleich und hebt dadurch die Eigenschaft Gottes auf. Ferner verwischt sie den Unterschied zwischen „gut" und „böse," und stellt alles Wirkliche als göttlich hin, als eine Offenbarung des All-Einen, vernichtet damit aber den **Gottesbegriff.**

Ferner löst sie entweder den Geist in die Materie auf, oder sie läßt die Materie vom Geist verzehrt werden. Mit der sittlichen Freiheit ist es auch nur bloßer Schein. Wir werden uns wohl auch nicht mit dieser Weltanschauung zufrieden geben.

## Nun einige Gedanken über die Stellung der Philosophie zur Theologie.

Ein Theologe hat einmal das Wort gesprochen, die Philosophie soll die beständige Begleiterin der Theologie sein, ohne daß sich beide vermischen und verwirren. Was sagen wir dazu?

Oft ist es sehr notwendig, daß die Theologie den Gang der Philosophie nicht ignorieren darf, ohne sich selbst wissenschaftlich herabzusetzen. Aber hier kommt der Punkt: Die Theologie darf nur mit der Philosophie einen Bund eingehen, die einen lebendigen, persönlichen Gott kennt, einen Gott, der ebensowenig außerhalb ist von der Welt, als in sie eingeschlossen, der ebensosehr transzendent als immanent ist. Somit kann also das biblische Christentum nur **die** Philosophie anerkennen, **die einerseits** die Seele und den Leib des Menschen in organischer Wechselbeziehung auffaßt, ohne das „Geistige" zur sublimierten Materie, oder diese (nämlich die Materie) zum Niederschlag des Geistes zu machen, **die andrerseits** eine persönliche Freiheit zugibt.

Eine solche Philosophie heißt im Gegensatz zur „deistischen" wie zur „pantheistischen" die **„theistische."** Aber auch nur den reinen „Theismus" kann das Christentum und in ihm die christliche Theologie als beständige Begleiterin willkommen heißen, denn mit einer Weltanschauung, die ein persönliches Verhältnis zu Gott aufhebt, könnte sich niemals die biblisch-theologische Wissenschaft befreunden.

Nun laßt uns einen Schritt weitergehen: Hatten Kant und seine Anhänger, bezw. die, welche den Kantianismus wiederaufnahmen in Form des „Neukantianismus," gewissermaßen den Dualismus vertreten, so trat mit „Häckel" eine neue Weltanschauung in den Vordergrund: **die monistische.**

Mit Haeckel trat ein enormer Umschwung ein, hatte doch schon der „Darwinismus" ihm die Wege geebnet. Gleich bei seinem Auftreten hat er die breiten Massen mit seinem naturwissenschaftlichen Materialismus so durchseucht, daß ihr jede Religion fast als ein überwundener Standpunkt erschien. Gott, Religion, Christus, das waren Worte, die leidenschaftlichen Widerspruch hervorriefen. Alle diejenigen, die sich noch getrauten, sie in dem Mund zu führen, galten als unwissenschaftlich und unaufgeklärt. Die meisten Anhänger fand er in dem gebildeten Mittelstand.

Um diese Anschauung zu brandmarken will ich **nur eine** erwähnen, nämlich das, was den Kern seiner Lehre trifft: Nach ihm gibt es keine besondre Seelensubstanz, keine Unsterblichkeit, keine Freiheit. Die Seele ist ihm nur eine „Funktion" der Phronema, stirbt somit mit dem Leib des Menschen.

Man mag nun über Haeckel und seine Werke denken, wie man will, das eine wenigstens steht fest: Er war eine charakteristische

Erscheinung. Damals war es geradezu lebensgefährlich, ihm in offener Versammlung entgegenzutreten, und auch heute noch hat er seine Anhänger in dem „Monistischen Bund," der schon viel Unheil angerichtet hat.

Ein andrer großer Gegner des Christentums des 19. Jahrhunderts war **Friedrich Nietzsche.** Er hatte mit tödlichem Haß den Kampf wider Christus aufgenommen und die Gebildeten mit sich gerissen. Er predigte in hinreißender Sprache: „**Jesus hat** den Menschen **nicht** das Leben **gebracht,** sondern **genommen.** Er war ein edler Mensch, ist aber zu früh gestorben, sonst hätte er seine Lehre widerrufen. Die Sünde ist schön; schön ist alles was unsre Lüste befriedigt; der richtige Mensch ist der Herrenmensch, der Uebermensch, jenseits von gut und böse, der ohne Rücksicht den Schwachen zertritt." Dies sind Worte aus seinem vielbesprochenen Buch „Der Antichrist." Wohl endete Nietzsche in Wahnsinn, aber seine Bücher haben ein Zeitalter der Selbstsucht und des Eigennutzes herbeigeführt.

Neben diesen beiden trieb noch eine weitere große Schar als Zeugen des Unglaubens ihr Wesen. Wäre der Weltkrieg nicht gekommen, so hätte die damalige Weltanschauung neue Triumphe gefeiert, und die Verkündigung des biblischen Wortes Gottes außerordentlich erschwert. Und wie ist es heute?

Häckel ist tot; sein Materialismus liegt in den letzten Zügen. Wer redet noch von Nietzsche? Wo hat sein Uebermenschentum unter den Gebildeten noch Anhänger? So schnell man ihm gehuldigt, hat man ihn auch vergessen. Jetzt ist man nun auf der Suche nach einer neuen Weltanschauung. Gefunden ist sie noch nicht, aber Richtlinien sind schon vorhanden. (Ich sehe ab von der Gottlosenpropaganda in Rußland, Spanien und Deutschland, die man natürlich nicht ganz übersehen darf, und die nur eine Reaktion des Häckelschen Materialismus ist.)

Welches sind nun die Richtlinien der neuen Weltanschauung mit denen sich die Philosophen und Theologen befassen: **Abkehr vom Sichtbaren, Hinkehr zum Unsichtbaren.** Diese Richtlinien scheinen auf einen neuen Idealismus oder Mystizismus hinzudeuten. Letzterer ist vor allem in der Barthschen Theologie zum Ausdruck gekommen. Auf der andern Seite sind starke Pietistische Strömungen zu verzeichnen, was man am besten in den Kreisen der E. C.-Bewegung wahrnehmen kann. Die Gebildeten jedoch können sich für diese Art der Evangelisation weniger begeistern: Sie huldigen vielfach dem sogenannten deutschen Idealismus. Man begeistert sich für Sonnenwendfeiern und dergleichen und greift in fanatischer Weise das alte Testament an, und man muß sich oft wundern, was diesbezüglich alles gegen dasselbe geschrieben wird. Aber trotz aller

Auswüchse hat sich der Wandel in der Weltanschauung in einer dem Christentum günstigen Weise vollzogen. Man könnte den Satz prägen: „Die Zeichen der Zeit verstehen, heißt heute, dem Volk die christliche Weltanschauung bringen."

Ein sehr bedeutsamer Faktor, der sich in den letzten Jahren bemerkbar gemacht hat, ist der sogenannte Weltprotestantismus: In den evangelischen Kirchen der ganzen Welt können wir eine Bewegung wahrnehmen, die auf engeren Zusammenschluß hinarbeitet. Eine Frucht dieser Einigungsbestrebungen war die Weltkonferenz in Stockholm im Jahre 1929. Wenn auch die verschiedenen Fragen noch sehr auseinander gingen, so hat sie aber doch den Weg geebnet, auf dem die Ueberbrückung der Gegensätze sich vollziehen kann.

Eine der neuesten religiösen Strömungen ist die vielbesprochene Anthroposophie. Sie ist entstanden aus dem Verlangen nach einem höheren, befriedigenderen Weltbild, das gleichzeitig der Erkenntnis genügt und den seelischen Bedürfnissen gerecht wird: Das Weltbild der Bibel wie es die evangelische Kirche dem Volk vor Augen gemalt hat, wird abgelehnt. An die Stelle des biblisch-religiösen Weltbildes tritt ein Naturwissenschaftliches. Im großen und ganzen wird man sagen müssen, daß es oft sehr schwer ist die Anthroposophie richtig zu durchschauen. Man könnte sie als ein Mittelding zwischen Wissenschaft und Religion hinstellen. Auf der einen Seite ist sie praktischer „Okkultismus," der die Gefühlsregungen erweckt und eine Anziehungskraft ausübt, auf der anderen Seite wird sie **Geisteswissenschaft** genannt.

Dr. Rudolf Steiner, Professor in Berlin, hat alle seine Kräfte für diese Richtung eingesetzt. Wer ihn selber kennen gelernt hat, oder sich mit seinen Büchern befaßt hat, muß sagen, daß er es meisterhaft verstanden hat, das Publikum anzuziehen. In seinem Buch „Wie erlangt man die Erkenntnis höherer Welten" legt er ausführlich dar, wie der Mensch nach seiner Meinung zu einem neuen Leben kommen kann.

Eine Geheimschulung ist erforderlich, durch die noch viele Fähigkeiten des Menschen, die früher verborgen waren, erweckt werden und Frucht bringen können. Drei Stufen sind hier zu absolvieren: **„Die Vorbereitung,"** sie entwickelt die geistigen Sinne, dann **„die Erleuchtung,"** sie zündet das geistige Licht an, endlich **„die Einweihung,"** sie eröffnet den Verkehr mit den höheren Wesenheiten des Geistes.

Dr. Steiner sagt: „Wer sich durch die Medidation erhebt zu dem, was den Menschen mit dem Geist verbindet, der beginnt in sich das zu beleben, was ewig in ihm ist, was nicht durch Geburt und Tod begrenzt ist. Nur diejenigen können zweifeln an einem

solchen Ewigen, die es nicht selbst erlebt haben. „Ein solcher Geheimschüler soll im Lauf der Zeit die Fähigkeit erhalten, hellzusehen mit ganz neuen Organen der Erkenntnis. Er steht im Mittelpunkt der Anthroposophie, und kann in die geistigen und übersinnlichen Welten eindringen, schaut und erkennt sie und wird auf diese Weise sein eigner Erlöser.

Wie wir aus obigen Darlegungen ersehen, empfindet das Wissen der modernen Zeit einen starken Drang nach Erkenntnis höherer Welten; man stürzt sich mit wahrer Gier auf das Gebiet des Mystizismus, Okkultismus und Spiritismus. Ueberall sieht man ein Suchen; aber man weiß noch nicht so recht, wo man finden wird.

Die mystische Strömung hat schon vor dem Weltkrieg eingesetzt. Man wollte die geheimnisvollen Tiefen ergründen, die in der Natur, der Welt und unserm eignen Wesen verborgen liegen. Der Weltkrieg konnte da nur günstig wirken. Nie trat der Tod so nahe vor die Augen als damals. Jeder fragte sich: „Was ist nach dem Tod?" „Wo sind unsre Entschlafenen?" Ein jeder suchte da nach einem inneren, sicheren Halt. Das kam teils dem biblischen Christentum, teils dem Aberglauben zugute, aber es war leider nur ein Strohfeuer, das schnell niederbrannte und nur wenige Früchte hinterließ.

Werfen wir kurz noch einen Blick auf Bewegungen unter der Jugend. Hier machten sich gleich nach dem Krieg neue Faktoren bemerkbar:

In den Kreisen der gebildeten Jugend des Mittelstandes war ein Streben nach christlich-sozialem Wirken. Aus diesem Trieb heraus wurden die sogenannten „Bibelkränzchen der V. K.-ler" gegründet, und die christliche Studentenbewegung machte weitere Fortschritte. Man wurde sich wieder des Ernstes bewußt. Und wenn man heute all die Jugendverbände betrachtet, auch die Aktivität der „Y. M. C. A.," so muß man sagen: Die Jugendbewegung steht heute am Scheideweg. Entweder sie wird Christus als den alleinigen Erlöser und Retter erkennen, oder sie wird ausgespielt haben.

Auf der anderen Seite herrscht unter der Jugend der Massenwille. Es wird eine Vereinigung nach der andern gegründet, die teils auf wirtschaftlichen Gebiet, teils auf politischem Gebiet wirken. Hier kennt man wenig von Gott, wenig von Christentum, hier will man nicht viel von Religion hören, oder man formt sich seine eigne, wie sie gerade in ihre jeweilige Interessen hineinpaßt. Es ist da ungeheuer schwer für Christus einzutreten und Seelen zu gewinnen. Man wird also hier nicht zu weit greifen, wenn man sagt: **„Der Antichrist ist auf dem Marsch."**

Da hat das Evangelium noch große Aufgaben vor sich. Wir

müssen aber davon überzeugt sein, daß in ihm große Kräfte verborgen sind und es zu guterletzt doch siegreich aus diesem Kampf hervorgehen wird. Im Vertrauen auf unsern größten Bundesgenossen, unsern Herrn Jesus Christus, nehmen wir alle mutig den Kampf auf. Er lebt, er kämpft, und er wird siegen! Und unser Glaube ist der Sieg, der die Welt überwunden hat, und wir bekennen mit Luther: „Mit unsrer Macht ist nichts getan, wir sind gar bald verloren! Es streit für uns der rechte Mann, den Gott hat selbst erkoren; Fragst du wer der ist? Er heißt Jesus Christ, der Herr Zebaoth, und ist kein andrer Gott, das Feld muß er behalten!"

Lassen wir nun die ganzen hier angeführten Weltanschauungen, Strömungen und Bewegungen noch einmal schnell in Gedanken an uns vorüberziehen! Was müssen wir als biblische Christen und biblische Theologen sagen? Wir werden zu folgendem Schluß kommen müssen: **Erkenne sie,** und das im rechten Licht, **sei auf der Hut,** es sind nicht alles Schafe, was in Schafskleidern geht, **und bewahre dir** auch in gefährlichen Zeiten den größten Kampfesschatz, **die Bibel!** Wenn wir diese drei Mahnungen nicht unbeachtet lassen, so werden wir vom Strom der Zeit nicht berührt werden und mit dem Dichter rühmen dürfen:

„Ein Vaterhaus ist immer nah,
Wie wechselnd auch die Lose:
Es ist das Kreuz auf Golgatha,
Heimat für Heimatlose!"

# „Christliche Oekumenik."

**(Vorschlag eines theologischen Faches.)**

Dr. Werner Petersmann.

## 1.

## „Christliche Oekumenik."

Wir leben heutzutage in der Tat in einem „oekumenischen Zeitalter." Die gute alte Zeit von Provinzialismus und Partikularismus ist vorüber. Nicht nur für Völker und Kulturen, sondern damit zugleich und vor allem auch für die Kirchen. Die idyllische Dornröschen-Vereinzelung, in der früher die Teile der Christenheit sich selber lebten, scheint endgültig vorbei zu sein, ob man nun mit oder ohne Tränen an ihrem Grab steht. Die Maschine hat unsre Welt — in der Terminologie der alten, weisen Griechen — wieder in die ständige Bewegung gebracht. In den „Fluß" universaler Berührungen, Verwobenheiten und Spannungen tausendfaltiger Art. Nolens volens erfährt da die Christenheit wieder ihre „katholische" Einheit und Solidarität. Dieselben vitalen Probleme und Bewegungen regen sie an und auf, erfassen und bewegen sie mit „universalem" Radius. Um nur einige zu nennen: da ist die Bibelkritik und die geschichtliche Methode; da ist die Ritschlsche und die religionsgeschichtliche Schule; da ist die soziale Frage und das soziale Evangelium; da ist der Appell an das Weltgewissen; da ist das kommunistisch-bolschewistische und das nationale Problem; da ist der große gemeinsame Fragenkreis der äußeren Mission (Jerusalem!); da ist die Welle des „mystischen" und des „liturgischen" Irrationalismus; da ist Liberalismus und positive Gegenbewegung und, „last not least," der Barthsche Hammerschlag, der die Welt erdröhnen macht. All diese Bewegungen „erregen den Erdkreis" („Oekumene"!) und „sind auch hierhergekommen" (Apg. 17, 6). Es ist einfach „biologisch" notwendig, daß die christlichen Kirchen diese ihre schlechterdings vor Augen und Händen liegende Lage erkennen und die Schlüsse daraus ziehen. Sie müssen versuchen einander kennen und verstehen zu lernen; sie müssen willens werden, von einander zu lernen und zusammen zu arbeiten in Denken und Handeln. Das ist hoch nötig angesichts derselben, erdumgreifenden, brennenden Schwierigkeiten und Bedrängnisse. So hat denn auch die Christenheit aus der Not eine Tugend zu machen — im besten Sinne dieses Wortes. Der dritte Glaubensartikel des Apostolikums hat (mit dem schönen biblischen Ausdruck des Religionsphilosophen Paul Tillich) seinen „Kairos," d. h. seinen schicksalsmächtigen Augenblick.

Das ist heute schon mehr Gemeinplatz als Gemeingut. Wir haben in der Tat ja unsre „ökumenischen Konferenzen" (Stockholm

1925, Lausanne 1927, Jerusalem 1929, London in Bälde). Wir haben deren Fortsetzungsausschüsse, Institute und literarischen Veröffentlichungen (z. B. die „ökumenische" Zeitschrift „Stockholm," herausgegeben von Adolf Keller, Genf. Leider hat diese Zeitschrift inzwischen ihr Erscheinen eingestellt. In deutscher Sprache vertreten „Christliche Welt" und „Eiche" etwa ihre Linien). Ganz ebenso entwickelt sich allgemein eine „ökumenische" Orientierung, die sich eigentlich in allen Zeitschriften spiegelt (nicht nur in den mehr „linken" wie der „Christlichen Welt" und dem „Christian Century," sondern auch in den rechten, wie etwa der „Bibliotheca Sacra"). Und doch, etwas höchst Wichtiges besitzen wir hierzulande noch nicht: das akademische Erziehungsmittel, **das theologische Fach,** das sich mit dieser neuen, zukunftsmächtigen Seite des modernen Christentums befaßt. Um der großen Wichtigkeit dieser Sache willen liegt einem darum daran, eben die Einführung eines solchen speziellen Faches in unsern amerikanischen theologischen Ausbildungsstätten vorzuschlagen. (Es braucht ja übrigens wirklich nicht erst die Chicago Divinity School oder das Chicago Theological Seminary alles Neue anzufangen!). Der passendste Name (das ist gewiß keine unwichtige Sache: nomen est omen!) für solch ein vorgeschlagenes Fach, den man bilden könnte, wäre wohl **„Oekumenik."** Das wäre in der Tat ein „Fach"-Name, terminologisch nach bekanntem Muster gebildet. Wir haben „Christliche Symbolik," „Christliche Dogmatik," „Christliche Ethik," „Christliche Homiletik" und „Christliche Katechetik" usw. Zu diesen dazu hätten wir dann eine **„Christliche Oekumenik"** (englisch: **„Christian Ecumenics"**). Es ist auch vielleicht nicht schwierig, sachliche Ansätze für ein solches Fach zu finden. Hier und da werden gewiß doch auf unsern amerikanischen Seminaren Vorlesungen gehalten über „Contemporary Christianity" oder „Contemporary Protestantism" (über welch letzteren Gegenstand ich selber z. B. einen „major course" und ein „seminar" gebe in unserm Eden). Solche Vorlesungen könnten natürlich mit Leichtigkeit um- und ausgebaut werden in eine allumfassende Behandlung der „ökumenischen" Lage und Frage der gegenwärtigen Christenheit: in eine „Christliche Oekumenik."

„Christliche Oekumenik" sollte freilich verbunden bleiben mit der „Christlichen **Symbolik**." Die Symbolik, ursprünglich die vergleichende Wissenschaft von den Unterscheidungs-„Lehren" der verschiedenen christlichen Kirchen auf Grund ihrer „Symbole" d. h. ihrer theologischen Bekenntnisformulierungen, entwickelt sich jüngst in der Tat in eine umfassendere „Konfessions-Kunde," die nun nicht mehr allein von den „doktrinellen" Unterscheidungen handelt, sondern sich müht, die ganze, wirkliche Art und den typischen Charakter einer Denomination zu begreifen. Ganz unverkennbar also

geht der Zug auf Allumfassen und auf das Verstehen der „anderen Kirche." Jedoch bleibt es die Aufgabe der „Symbolik," kritisch das eigenartige „Wesen" der verschiedenen Kirchenkörper auf dem Grund ihrer geschichtlichen Entstehung zu bestimmen. Die „christliche Oekumenik" dagegen würde mit dem gegenwärtigen Stand und Leben dieser Kirchenkörper zu tun haben und mit ihren gemeinsamen wie besonderen heutigen Nöten und Fragen. Und die „Oekumenik" würde damit zu tun haben in der Perspektive der tatsächlich vorhandenen „oekumenischen" Solidarität und des notwendigen „ökumenischen" Zusammenkommens und Zusammenarbeitens. Sie würde den Geist freundschaftlichen Verstehens zu pflegen haben, den Geist gegenseitiger Achtung, den Geist der Willigkeit, nicht nur „den anderen" zu belehren, sondern auch vom „anderen" zu lernen und anzunehmen in großem gegenseitigen Austausch der Wahrheiten und Geistesgaben, in wechselseitiger Korrektur und Bereicherung. In solch „pfingstlichem" Geist theoretischer und praktischer Zusammenarbeit hätte die Orientierung, der Durchblick und Ausblick stets und grundsätzlich „ökumenisch" gerichtet zu sein, d. h. auf die „ganze" („universale," „katholische") Christenheit. Keineswegs freilich soll damit für einen modernen Relativismus und Pragmatismus eingetreten werden, für einen flachen und armen Synkretismus, für einen charakterlosen und standardisierenden Unionismus. Diese ständige, gefährliche „Charybdis" der ökumenischen Bewegung gegenüber der „Skylla" konfessionalistischer Isolation! Keineswegs! Weder darf die Grundfrage und der Grundmaßstab der „Wahrheit" mit dem Achselzucken des Pilatus (oder irgendeiner andern Geste) vernachlässigt werden, noch sollte innerhalb der Christenheit die „konfessionelle" (oder andre) Individualität ausgemerzt werden, die doch eine notwendige Aufgabe hat: die Aufgabe nämlich der bereichernden Mannigfaltigkeit, der Gleichgewichtsherstellung und der Ergänzung, und auch der korrigierenden Spannung. Auf jeden Fall sollt die christliche „Oekumenik" tief in der christlichen „Symbolik" wurzeln, wobei die „Symbolik" wiederum die Tatsache nicht aus den Augen verlieren darf, daß der Auftrag der christlichen Kirche das „Ministerium Verbi Divini" ist, der „Dienst am göttlichen Wort." Die Predigt des Wortes Gottes (gewiß nicht nur ein „Predigen" durch „Sprechen," sondern auch durch „Handel" und „Wandel"; jedoch zunächst und grundlegend durch das gesprochene „Wort" selber!) verlangt aber Klarheit und Präzision der Botschaft, die man zu bringen hat. Und darum muß auch die **„theologische"** Frage und der „Lehr"-Maßstab („Wahrheit" und „Klarheit") im Zentrum bleiben — und nicht etwa der „soziologische," der „ethische," der „pragmatische" usw. Im Zentrum nicht nur der „Symbolik" wie der

„Oekumenik," sondern im Mittelpunkt aller Fächer der „Theologie" insgesamt! Der „ökumenische" Ausblick und Aufruf darf die „theologische" Warnung nicht unterdrücken und das „theologische" Charisma der „Unterscheidung der Geister" nicht beschneiden. Daß beides zusammen sehr wohl möglich ist, versuchte unsre **ökumenische Kirchen-Postille**[1]) deutlich genug zu zeigen. Als ein Mittel innerhalb der **„liturgischen"** Bewegung[2]) versucht sie in der Tat den „ökumenischen" Geist und Ausblick so zu pflegen, indem sie aus dem Chor der „una santa" die Geschichte der Christenheit hindurch solche Stimmen und Stücke aussucht und zusammenstellt, die bestimmt und deutlich „evangelischen" Charakter tragen. In diesem Sinn und Geist unsrer Predigtsammlung (und in keinem andern!) wird hier das Fach und der Betrieb einer „christlichen Oekumenik" vorgeschlagen.

2.

## „Oekumenische Kirchenkunde."

In Europa gibt es seit einiger Zeit an manchen Universitäten Vorlesungen über **„Kirchenkunde,"** die in unsrer Hinsicht wichtig sind. Schon **Schleiermacher** (auch hier ein Anreger!) schlug eine „Kirchliche Statistik" vor. Er verstand darunter eine „Darstellung des gesellschaftlichen Zustandes der Kirche in einem gegebenen Moment." Um die Jahrhundertwende nahm **Paul Drews** diese Anregung auf und führte zuerst eine „Religiöse Volkskunde" und dann eine „Evangelische Kirchenkunde" ein.[3]) Diese Fächer wurden Zweige der „Praktischen Theologie." Drews begann die literarische Ausarbeitung des neuen Faches der „Kirchenkunde," indem er die Sammlung „Evangelische Kirchenkunde" herausgab, in der er den ersten Band selber schrieb: eine Darstellung des Lebens der Landeskirche Sachsens (1901). Diese Sammlung, die nunmehr von Professor M. Schian herausgegeben wird, umfaßt heute sieben

---

1) Anm. Verlag Toepelmann, Gießen, 1927. Vgl. Besprechung im „Theol. Magazine" von November 1928, ebenso („The Voice of the Whole Church") im „Christian Century" vom 8. Oktober 1930.

2) Anm. Der „ökumenische" Sinn und Geist könnte und sollte in der Tat vor allem erweckt und gepflegt werden durch das unmittelbare und schlechterdings grundlegende Mittel des Gottesdienstes, des **Kultus.** Selbst der isolierte und strengste Konfessionalismus verwendet hier „ökumenische" Güter der Heiligen Schrift, der Glaubensbekenntnisse, des Vaterunsers und der betreffenden andern Stücke der Liturgie. Vgl. die Ausführungen und Vorschläge in meinem Artikel über **„Kultische Katholizität"** in der Stockholm-Nummer der „Christlichen Welt." Weitere „theologische" Grundlegungen dafür später, in einem Buch über **„„Kult"-Theozentrische Theologie,"** das hoffentlich bald erscheinen kann.

3) Anm. Monatsschrift für kirchliche Praxis 1901.

Bände (Sachsen, Schlesien, Baden, Bayern, Thüringen, Hannover, Württemberg). Dieser Sproß aber, und seine Literatur entwickelte sich im Lauf der Zeit in „ökumenischer" Richtung. Seit 1907 wurde eine „Kirchenkunde des Evangelischen Auslands" veröffentlicht, als Unterabteilung der „Studien zur Praktischen Theologie," ediert von C. Clemen und N. Eger. Durch die Kriegs- und Nachkriegs-Schwierigkeiten ist freilich die akademisch-literarische Ausarbeitung dieses Faches verlangsamt worden. Jedoch ist eine Literatur im Wachsen, die eine entschiedene Neigung zeigt auf eine „ökumenische Kirchenkunde" hin, zumal die „ökumenischen Konferenzen" in Stockholm und Lausanne stattgefunden haben und ihren Einfluß auswirken. Der hervorragende Vertreter dieser Entwicklung der Kirchenkunde ist Dr. **Adolf Keller,** Professor an den Universitäten Zürich und Genf und vormals europäischer Sekretär des amerikanischen Federal Council, der Mann des „Welt-Protestantismus," bekannt als ein Führer der „ökumenischen Bewegung." Also kommt die Anregung zum Fach der „Christlichen Oekumenik" vom europäischen Mutterland. Zumal aber da Amerika die „Webe-Maschine" und der „Misch"- und „Schmelz-Tiegel" der Nationen und Denominationen ist, und da dies sowohl als auch das „Pioniertum" den Eigencharakter Amerikas bestimmen, warum sollte da Amerika, das also für diese Sache providentiell begünstigt ist, nicht auch hier „pionierhafte" Versuche einrichten an der „Grenze" der Zukunft der Christenheit?

3.

## Wichtigste Literatur.

Auf dasjenige Buch wurde in unserm „Theologischen Magazin"[4]) schon eingehend hingewiesen, das den Schreiber dieses auf das stärkste angeregt hat in der Richtung auf eine „Christliche Oekumenik." Es ist ein Buch, das — höchst stimulierend! — in einer europäischen Besprechung „eine ökumenische Kirchenkunde" genannt worden war: „Der Protestantismus der Gegenwart," unter Mitwirkung führender Persönlichkeiten des kirchlichen und theologisch-wissenschaftlichen Lebens herausgegeben von Stadtpfarrer Dr. **G. Schenkel.** (Verlag Bohnenberger, Stuttgart, Auflagen seit 1926, zirka 40 Reichsmark.) Es gehört zu der „eisernen Ration" in des Schreibers Kursen über „Contemporary Protestantism." Als allerdings der Herausgeber ihn fragte, ob nicht eine Uebersetzung ins Englische angebracht sei, hat er, so leid es ihn tat, verneinend antworten müssen. Das Buch ist für den amerikanischen Leser wohl zu „dick" (800 Quartseiten!), um hier so gut zu gehen wie in Deutschland.

4) Anm. Vgl. „Oekumenische Kirchenkunde des Protestantismus der Gegenwart," Theol. Mag. No. 4, 1930.

Ein ausgezeichnetes englisches Buch haben wir freilich auch schon zur Verfügung, wenn es auch zunächst nur eine „ökumenisch" bestimmte Gesamtschau des europäischen Protestantismus für den amerikanischen Leser gibt. Das ist „Protestant Europe, Its Crisis and Outlook," von Dr. **Adolf Keller** und Dr. **George Stewart,** mit einem Vorwort von Charles S. Macfarland (385 Seiten, Doran Co. 1927, jetzt Smith, zirka $3). Dieses zweite Buch (das ebenso zu der „eisernen Ration" meiner Kurse gehört!) hält, obwohl ein recht stattlicher Band für amerikanische Begriffe, die angenehme goldenen Mitte in mannigfacher Hinsicht. Im gleichen Jahr erschienen Dr. **August Hinderers** „Oekumenisches Schrifttum" und **Cajus Fabricius'** „Oekumenisches Handbuch der christlichen Kirchen" (letzteres auch in englischer Uebersetzung: „Ecumenical Handbook of the Churches of Christ," 1927). Wichtig ist ebenfalls die im folgenden Jahr (1928) beginnende Veröffentlichung von Cajus Fabricius: „Corpus Confessionum. Die Bekenntnisse der Christenheit, eine Sammlung grundlegender Urkunden aus allen Kirchen der Gegenwart." Um „Protestant Europe" (oben) gewissermaßen „ökumenisch" auszurunden, sei hier für Amerika hingewiesen auf **Charles Stelles** „The New Handbook of the Churches, A Survey of the Churches in Action" (J. E. Stohlmann, Publishers, 129 Park Row, New York City, published for the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. 337 Seiten. 1930. $2.50). Dies Werk ist kirchenkundlich einfach notwendig. Es setzt das bekannte „Year Book of the Churches" fort, enthält alles wissenswerte statistische Material („Directory of Religious Bodies, of Church Cooperation etc.," „Religious Statistics etc.") und dazu eine Reihe von Aufsätzen über die neuesten religiösen Entwicklungen (auf den ersten 85 Seiten, z. B. über das Verschwinden des „Separatismus" in den Kirchen, von Cadman; über das Verhältnis von Kirche und Staat, von McConnell; über Kirchen-Einigungs-Bewegungen, von Cavert; über die „United Church of Canada," von Stauffer; über die „Community Church"-Bewegung, von Hargreaves usw.).

## 4.
## Ein jüngstes, führendes Werk!

Das Buch aber, das hier in der Tat einen wegweisenden „Führer" darstellt, ist kürzlich erschienen aus der Feder Dr. **Adolf Kellers:** „Der Weg der dialektischen Theologie durch die kirchliche Welt. Eine kleine Kirchenkunde der Gegenwart" (212 Seiten, kartoniert 3.80, gebunden 5 Reichsmark. Chr. Kaiser-Verlag, München 1931). Geschrieben von dem Mann, der dazu am meisten berufen ist, weil er ohne Zweifel der beste Kenner der gegenwärtigen kirchlichen Welt ist, wie auch die englisch-amerikanische Presse stets anerkennt, und

weil die ökumenische Bewegung ihm die Lebensarbeit bedeutet, — wird dieses glänzende Werk selber seinen „Weg durch die kirchliche Welt" machen. Wer die „großen Buchstaben" von Kellers „eigenhändigem" Stil kennt (etwa aus der „Christlichen Welt"), der wird eine höchst lebendige, geistvolle und großzügige Erörterung der gesamtkirchlichen Lage und Problematik der Gegenwart erwarten, — und er wird tatsächlich nicht enttäuscht.

1. Im ersten, einleitenden Kapitel (Seite 3—13) „Zur Kirchenkunde der Gegenwart" führt Keller die **neuen Aufgaben einer „Kirchenkunde der Gegenwart"** aus. Diese neuen Aufgaben ergeben sich aus der **ökumenischen** Bewegung, durch welche die bisher vereinzelten Kirchen zu geistiger Berührung und Auseinandersetzung größten Stils genötigt werden. Das muß in „ökumenischer Gesinnung" geschehen, in Demut und Wissen um Gemeinschaft. In solcher Gesinnung treibt die ökumenische Kirchenkunde eine vergleichende „Wesensschau" des heutigen Kirchentums. Gewonnen wird diese Wesensschau, indem die geschichtliche kirchliche Wirklichkeit jeweils verstanden wird „als Wirkung eines einmaligen und spezifischen Wortes (Gottes) im konkreten Material einer historischen Situation, eines besonderen Volkstums, einer besonderen religiösen Problematik, eines Kairos." Aus solcher Wesensschau heraus muß dann gefragt werden, wie sich die konkrete Kirchlichkeit verhält zu dem besonderen Auftrag, aus dem sie hervorgegangen ist (das lutherische „Sola Fide"; das kalvinische „Soli Deo Gloria"; das anglikanische „to realize a presence" usw.). Mit dieser Frage wird aber jede konkrete Kirklichkeit problematisch von ihrer eigenen Wesensschau her, und da ist keine, die sich rühmen könnte, auch nicht eine. Der Balken steckt im eignen Auge. Mit solcher Selbsteinkehr beginnt die Verständigung, weil hier — bei aller anerkannten Besonderheit und Verschiedenheit der konkreten Situation! — die gleiche, all-gemeine Not vorliegt vor Gott, der das „Wort," den Auftrag gibt. Diese „theozentrische" Grundfrage, dieser Standort und Maßstab der „vergleichenden ökumenischen Kirchenkunde," der über jedem einzelnen Kirchentum liegt, ist schon von der **Barthschen** Theologie her gegeben und geboten. Mit meisterlichem Griff also wendet Keller die mächtigen Gesichtspunkte der Theologie der Krisis auf die ökumenische Bewegung und die Kirchenkunde an.

2. Diesem kurzen Schlüssel-Erfassen aber folgt dann der zweite meisterliche Griff. Das Aufschließen beginnt, und die Tore springen. **Die „dialektische Theologie" selber wird „wie ein theologischer Sextant" gebraucht,** mit dem die Stellung der einzelnen kirchlichen Sternbilder in der heutigen religiösen Gesamtlage bestimmt werden. Sie ist ein „Zeitbild," nein die „Zeitgestalt" der gegenwärtigen kirchlichen Problematik. In einer Periode der Krisis des

optimistischen Kulturidealismus dringt die Barthsche Theologie des Absoluten, des Theozentrischen, des anti-humanistischen Pessimismus überall vor — als prophetisch-kritischer Frager und Erfüller in einer „ökumenisch" gleichen Lage aller Kirchen, die ja grund-sätzlich dieselbe Lage ist — vor Gott! So zeigt denn Keller mit Scharfblick auf und zeichnet mit geübtem Griffel, wie diese Theologie die einzelnen Kirchen beeinflußt, wie diese darauf antworten, was sie von ihr aufnehmen und was sie ablehnen. Das macht den konkreten Hauptteil des Buches aus. (Kapitel II bis VIII, Seiten 13—168). Er skizziert zuerst die dialektische Theologie als „Zeitgestalt" und in ihren „Kampffronten" (Kirche, Theologie, Wissenschaft) und führt dann durch die ökumenische Kirchenwelt, jeweils die konkrete Lage einer Kirche bestimmend an ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit dem Barthianismus. So tauchen vor uns auf: die deutsche Schweiz, Deutschland, Skandinavien, Holland, Frankreich und der lateinische Protestantismus, England, Schottland und Amerika (!), danach in Sonderkapiteln der römische Katholizismus, die griechisch-orthodoxe Kirche und die Mission. In der Barthschen Konstellation ist die Christenheit lebendig-aktuell erfaßt und eindrucksvoll in ihren partikularen Besonderheiten und ihrer gemeinsamen Not geschildert.

3. Zu diesem zweiten kommt am Schluß (Seite 168 bis 188) der dritte meisterliche Griff: **die Rechtfertigung und Vertiefung der „ökumenischen Bewegung" gerade mit und an der Barthschen Theologie.** Mit religiöser Leidenschaft setzt sich Keller ein für die Verbindung dieser beiden, heute die Welt umspannenden Bewegungen. Zumal wer sich oft genug an flachen, seichten Auffassungen in der „ökumenischen Bewegung" gestoßen hat, wird es von Herzen begrüßen, daß Keller hier die Fundamente entschieden tiefer legt — ein allerhöchst nötiges Geschäft! Und ganz ebenso wird er es begrüßen, daß gerade von der Zentralposition Karl Barths her ihm — und andern — ein Weg gewiesen wird zur ökumenischen Bewegung hin. Von ganzem Herzen möchte man nur wünschen, daß der also begriffene „Geist und Ursprung" auch wirklich die ökumenische Bewegung durchdränge, durchsäuere und leite mit seiner Echtheit, Grundkraft und Tiefe.

# EDITORIALS

## GENERAL SYNOD OF REFORMED CHURCH ACTS ON MERGER

On June 27 the General Synod of the Reformed Church in the United States, assembled in session at Akron, Ohio, adopted the Plan of Union unanimously. Just before the final vote Professor Richards took the floor for a brief plea in support of the pending resolution. He reminded the Synod of the fact that the two Churches were closely akin in faith and in racial descent. The Reformed people arrived first in this country, about a hundred years before the Evangelicals, and settled in the Eastern states of this land. The Evangelicals came when the Western regions were being opened, and occupied the middle and, later, the far west. It so happened, therefore, that the Reformed are strongest where the Evangelicals are weak and vice versa. In this way the two Churches will supplement each other geographically; and there is no doubt that in other respects the union will benefit both parties of the agreement.

If Dr. Richards had been apprehensive that there might still be opposition to the Plan in some quarters, he was soon happily disappointed. The whole Synod rose like one man and the Union plan was endorsed without a dissenting voice.

The Plan will now go to the Classes of the Church, for final action, the stronger and older Classes meeting this fall, the others next spring. There are fifty-eight such classes in the Church, those in the East being much stronger than those in the Middle West, although the Synod is also substantially represented in Ohio. What we in the Evangelical Synod call Districts is represented in the Reformed Church by the Synods; there are five or six of them, the one in Pennsylvania being the largest. Here, in Lancaster, Pa., is also the largest theological institution of the Church.

The German language has largely disappeared in the Eastern Synods, owing to the many generations that have passed away since the Church was founded. In the Ohio and other western Synods the German still has a footing. The "Reformierte Kirchenzeitung" (Dr. Heyl, editor), the German weekly, has over 2,000 readers; the English weekly, the "Christian World" (Dr. Gekkeler, editor) has over 6,000 subscribers. We have no special information about the "Messenger", the leading religious paper in the Reformed Church.

The Reformed Church has no periodical anymore corresponding to our "Theological Magazine." Until 1917 they had a German "Theologische Zeitschrift"; also a paper in English, of that type (surviving a little longer, if our memory serves us correctly). But now they are things of the past. Naturally we cherish the hope that those in the Reformed Church that desire theological food will rally to the support of the "Theological Magazine."

The Plan of Union will be submitted to our Districts next year and will go from there to the General Conference in the fall of 1933 for final disposition. We have no doubt that the Synod will support the Plan whole-heartedly.

## COMMUNION OF SAINTS

Some time ago a member of an adult class, in one of our Sunday Schools, asked the teacher: "What is the Communion of Saints?" (as mentioned in the Apostles' Creed). The teacher didn't know. So it was referred to different gatherings of Evangelical ministers. Some could not give an answer, others differed in their interpretation. Since the Apostles' Creed receives so little consideration, as a rule, and is often looked upon almost with contempt, it seems worth while to us to make some little contribution to this subject here. The statement under discussion is a part of the third article. This article speaks first of the Holy Spirit and then of the Spirit's product, the Church. This Church is said to be one, holy, universal, Christian. These attributes emphasize the oneness and universality of the Church. Regardless of time, place, race, language, it is one. Geographically separate, it has the same faith and Lord everywhere; is therefore one. But then every day, every hour and minute, some pass away from this earthly scene and from the visible Church. They are not lost, they go to the Church triumphant. But although not seen with the mortal eye, there is a bond of fellowship between the Church here and there. The well known hymn ("The Church's one Foundation") expresses it beautifully (verses 4 and 5):

> "Yet she (the Church) on earth has union
> With God the Three in One,
> And mystic sweet communion
> With those whose rest is won."

Luther explained the word "communion" as meaning "Gemeine or Gemeinde" the persons in the Church united by the same faith. In this Church (or "Gemeinde"), he says, all things are held in common and the prayers and good works of the Church benefit every member. By faith and sacramental fellowship one becomes

a member of this Church. Such members are all "Saints". The Saints of the Catholic Church he rejects.

The Reformed Church interprets the word "communion" as fellowship, not community (Luther). The "Heidelberg Catechism" says in question 50, "What doest thou understand by the "Communion of Saints"? "First, that all believers as members of Christ have part in him and all his treasures and gifts; secondly, that each one must feel himself bound to use his gifts, readily and cheerfully, for the advantage and welfare of other members." One sees that the Heidelberg Catechism is less "mystical" in its explanation than Luther or the hymn quoted above

At what time the "Communio Sanctorum" came into the Creed, cannot be made out, but it must have been quite early. Originally these "Sancti" were the whole Christian Church. However in time, with the development of the doctrine of the "Saints," the emphasis was laid on the Church in heaven and those members of it especially who were considered Saints in a particular sense. These Saints, so Catholic theology came to teach, had laid up for the general Church a treasure of good works, on which Christians on earth could draw. On the other hand, since nearly all people have to go through purgatory, the prayers and masses of the believers here on earth are believed to benefit the souls in purgatory, lessening the duration of the time needed for their expiation and purification. In this way the communion of saints includes the militant Church here, the suffering Church in purgatory and the triumphant Church in heaven.

The Reformation condemned all these specifically Roman teachings about the Saints, their treasure of good works, their worship, as well as all the purgatorial views and practices.

## THE PROPHET IN THE PULPIT

About twenty-five years ago the message went out into the world or, rather, to the church that it was time for Christianity to concern itself with the salvation of society as well as of individuals. The preacher, so it said, had been a priest, a pastor and a soul-winner long enough. Now he was to add to these roles another, important one, he was to be a prophet. The prophets, in the best periods of their activity, had busied themselves with the reconstruction of human society, not with the salvation of individuals only. They had been advocates of the downtrodden, they had denounced the selfishness and injustice of the ruling classes. In this way they had injected politics of a very substantial kind into their preaching.

We haven't the time here to show how it came that the social

preaching of the prophets, although endorsed by the implications of the kingdom-of-God idea of Jesus, was for so many centuries relegated to the background. We can only say that for a quarter of a century the preachers have been urged with ever greater insistence to learn from the prophets. It is true that the "call" of the prophet was different from what most preachers would present as the motives for their being in the ministry. But, nevertheless, the Church as a whole is today held responsible for the injustice in the land. It is considered the task of the Church to "lift the burdens of the poor," not only in the philanthropic sense but in the sense of striving for a better distribution of worldly goods.

There are some Lutherans who still claim that all the Church is to do is proclaim the gospel and administer the sacraments. But all those churches connected with the Federal Council believe in Social Ideals. The Methodists in their last General Conference condemned the whole Capitalistic System and recommended a series of initial steps towards securing a better social order. And, besides this, they deserve the gratitude of all interested in international justice for the resolution they passed concerning the lie of the sole responsibility of Germany for the World War and the lifting of further reparation payments from the shoulders of our unhappy fatherland.

Some advocaters of the social gospel go to the very limit in their condemnation of the Church for its failure to abolish poverty and to improve the lot of the masses. We refer e.g. to the book by P. Hutchinson on revolution and religion (see Book Review page 397). According to him the Church is intellectually bankrupt, socially impotent and morally antiquated. Organized religion will shortly disappear entirely and our hope we can pin only on outsiders, who may build something new in the future.

It seems to us the Church, or at least some Churches, are going as fast as they can. No one knows for sure how the new social order is to come to pass. Many are seeking inside and outside the Church for a solution. If Churches in their conferences fail to come up to the expectations of the socially-minded and the progressive thinkers, what about political Conventions? Both of the great parties were assembled together lately and the great problem to be solved was not the depression but the prohibition question. The Church is in part to blame for that. Had the Church not tried by a constitutional amendment to compel even those states to abstain that don't believe in the 18th amendment, the resentment would not be so fanatic. The question is not now, Is prohibition good or bad? but, Is it right to force it on those states the majority of whose citizens are not in favor of it? Experience seems to have

shown that it is not the right thing. The law is on the statutes or even in the constitution, but it is not enforced.

Our Synod, since the days of Dr. Pister, has not taken official position for or against Prohibition or the 18th amendment. We believe a majority is against Prohibition and for Resubmission.

As far as the individual pastor is concerned, those who feel a special "call" will and may use their pulpit for a wise advocacy of social readjustment. This class will be mostly recruited from the young, although some older ones are in step with the urge of the time (think of the late Dr. Vollmer and his long years of social gospel study and activity). The rest of the ministry will go along the old paths until they are perhaps overtaken by great and unexpected developments. But even those who work as before for individual moral and spiritual improvement are by no means spending their labor in vain.

## „Ihr werdet weder auf diesem Berge noch in Jerusalem anbeten."

Joh. 4, 21.

Das samaritische Weib (Joh. 4) hatte erkannt, daß der mit ihr redete, ein Prophet sei und zugleich ein Herzenskündiger. Um das Gespräch von sich selbst abzulenken, legt sie ihm eine Streitfrage vor: Ist der Berg Gerizim der rechte Gebetsort, oder ist es Jerusalem? Der Herr antwortet: Es kommt die Zeit, da man weder auf die eine Stätte beschränkt sein wird, noch auf die andre. Gott ist ein Geist, und die ihn in geistlicher Weise anbeten, finden ihn überall. Nichts desto weniger, so fügt der Herr hinzu, ist da ein Unterschied zwischen Samaritern und Juden. Die letzteren hat der Vater erwählt, daß sie die Träger des Heils werden sollten für die übrige Welt.

Man findet in diesen Worten eine merkwürdige **Mischung des Geistlichen,** an keinen Platz und keine Tradition Gebundenen **und des Historischen,** und man tut wohl, diese beiden Momente allezeit zusammen zu halten. Als Johannes dieses Zwiegespräch niederschrieb, war die Kirche des Herrn schon von Jerusalem und dem Tempel geschieden. Andre Städte waren stärkere Quellpunkte des christlichen Lebens geworden als Jerusalem. Auch war man zu der Erkenntnis gekommen, daß „in allem Volk wer Gott fürchtet und recht tut, ist ihm angenehm." Aber dennoch fuhren die Apostel fort, die historische Vorzugsstellung Israels anzuerkennen und die Gaben Gottes an das „Volk der Verheißung" sich zu nutze zu machen. Auf diese Weise blieben das Geistliche (Uebergeschichtliche) und das Historische in steter Wechselwirkung.

Heute ist die Neigung vielfach vorhanden, das eine von den andern zu trennen. Man unterscheidet die **Kirche des Geistes** von der Kirche **der Autorität,** das ist der geschichtlich Gewordenen. In dem Buch (von Peabody, glaube ich) „The Church of the Spirit and the Church of Authority" wird der Nachweis versucht, daß beinahe aller Fortschritt im Glauben und Leben von denen ausging, die von der Kirche als Ketzer verschrien wurden, und daß die amtlich verfaßte Kirche den Geist tausendfach zu dämpfen versucht habe. Natürlich ist in diesem Vorwurf nicht wenig Wahrheit. Wie viele Verbrechen sind nicht im Namen der Kirche und in „maiorem dei gloriam" begangen worden, und wie oft war nicht das wahre Christentum bei den Kreisen die von der offiziellen Kirche mit Mißtrauen angesehen wurden.

Dennoch sollte uns das nicht dazu führen, die Kirche als Institution gering zu achten oder alles was in ihr feste Form gefunden hat, als eine Fessel des Geistes zu empfinden. Liberale und radikale Kritiker haben es leicht, die Kirche als eine rückständige Institution in Grund und Boden zu verdammen. Sie nennen sie ein Werkzeug in der Hand des Kapitalismus, um den „Status quo" aufrecht zu erhalten. Oder sie richten ihre Angriffe auf die Bekenntnisse der Kirche, als seien dieselben von der Wissenschaft gänzlich überholt und sollten daher mit Fug und Recht zum alten Eisen geworfen werden. Sie bedenken nicht, daß ohne die Institution der Kirche das Evangelium wahrscheinlich nur noch im Besitz einiger gottseligen Gemüter sich befinden würde; daß wenn der vielgerühmte Mystizismus oder Spiritualismus (nicht: Spiritismus) als einzige Form der Frömmigkeit übrig bliebe, der Einfluß des Christentums auf die organisierte Gesellschaft gleich Null sein würde.

Auf der andern Seite lehrt uns aber auch das Wort des Herrn, das Geschichtliche und Institutionelle nicht zu überschätzen. Israel blieb streng an dem Ueberlieferten haften und verwarf das Evangelium: es verpfändete seine Zukunft.

Die christliche Kirche wurde unter Roms Führung eine äußere Weltmacht, die als Erzieherin der Barbaren Großes leistete. Aber es war die Kirche nicht mehr Mittel zum Zweck, sondern Selbstzweck. „Extra ecclesiam nulla salus" war die Kirchenlehre. Der Herr hatte gesagt: Die Zeit kommt, wo ihr weder in Jerusalem noch sonstwo anbeten werdet, das ist als wäre es in Jerusalem wirkungskräftiger als sonstwo. Dem Katholizismus ist Rom der Mittelpunkt der Welt, das Papsttum der Stellvertreter Jesu, die Messe die Verleiblichung des Gekreuzigten.

Und nicht nur ist diese Objektivierung des Geistlichen der Schaden Roms. Die Episkopalkirche ist auf dem besten Weg sich zu romanisieren. Nur die Kirche ist ihr die wahre, die historisch

die ununterbrochene Abstammung ihres Bischofsamtes von den Aposteln nachweisen kann. Nur solche Ordination gilt, die von solchen Bischöfen vollzogen ist. Es ist das anerkannte Streben des Anglo-Katholizismus, das „ganze katholische Erbe wieder zu gewinnen": Messe, Privatbeichte, Verehrung der Heiligen und besonders der Maria, prunkende Gewänder, feierliche Umzüge usw., mit einem Wort, das ganze religiöse Leben zu versinnlichen, zu objektivieren, es in äußerlich wahrnehmbaren Zeichen zu symbolisieren und handgreiflich zu machen. Das ist ein Bestreben, welches den Grundsätzen des Herrn, in unserm Textwort ausgesprochen, diametral zuwiderläuft.

In unsrer eigenen Kirche ist die Gefahr, das Geistliche zu objektivieren, nicht so groß im allgemeinen. Wir sind mehr in Gefahr, von der Kirche als Institution zu wenig zu denken. Wir neigen ein wenig dazu, das Sakrament des Altars zu einem „opus operatum" zu machen, als wenn die bloße Feier desselben von Wert sei, z. B. in unsrer Vorliebe für „corporate communions."

Damit wollen wir nicht sagen, daß wir das Geistliche gepachtet hätten. Wir sind alle zu drei Vierteln Fleisch und Bein. Wir bedürfen alle des Geistes von oben, besonders die Pastoren. Sonst fehlt ihnen die göttliche Legitimation, und wer wird auf sie hören, wenn sie die nicht haben?

## Das kommende sechzigjährige Jubiläum des „Theologischen Magazins."

Am 1. Januar 1933 sind es sechzig Jahre, daß das „Theologische Magazin" gegründet wurde. Wir künden das schon heute an, um zunächst den Teil unsrer Leser zu interessieren, der die deutschen Artikel und editoriellen Aeußerungen besonders beachtet. Wir haben vor einigen Jahren diesem Kreis unsrer Leser etwas weh getan, indem wir, in bester Meinung und Absicht, „der Not gehorchend, nicht dem eignen Triebe," dem Englischen den ersten Platz einräumten. Wir hoffen, daß sie uns das bis jetzt vergeben haben. Sind doch die deutschen Leser des „Magazins" sonst immer die treuesten Freunde des Blattes gewesen, und müssen sie doch auch zugeben, daß wir dem Deutschen im ganzen nach Kräften gerecht werden.

Wir hoffen, daß unsre Freunde uns helfen werden, die kommende Festnummer bestens zu verbreiten, und daß sie ihr Möglichstes tun werden, uns neue Leser zu gewinnen; daß besonders diejenigen, denen ich einen persönlichen Brief schreibe, sich zugänglich erweisen mögen. Es wird wahrscheinlich nicht lange mehr dauern, bis sich die Reformierten mit uns vereinigen. Die Reformierten

haben keine theologische Zeitschrift mehr. Um so wichtiger und aussichtsvoller wird es sein, unser **„Magazin" kräftig zu unterstützen,** so daß es mit voller Zuversicht sich an die kommenden Reformierten Brüder wenden darf mit der Bitte, dem „Theologischen Magazin" ihre Freundschaft zuzuwenden. „Wir wollen sein ein einig Volk von Brüdern," um mit Schiller zu reden. Das „Magazin" kann ein wesentliches Mittel sein, diesem Ideal zur Verwirklichung zu verhelfen.

# The Christian World

## Brothers and Sisters

*We believe in the Scripture of the Old and New Testaments as verbally inspired by God . . . supreme and final authority on faith and life.* In this belief last week assembled the 15th annual convention of the World's Christian Fundamentals Association, in Columbus, Ohio. Brothers and sisters they call one another—Christianized Jews, Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, all sects represented but—the Roman Catholic. The sisters outnumber the brothers. *We believe in "that blessed hope," the personal, pre-millenial and imminent return of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.* At the door of big Columbus Memorial Hall stacks of pamphlets: "Shall We Longer Tolerate the Teaching of Evolution?" "The Doom of Democracy." On the platform, speakers and officers, addressing the brothers and sisters eight times a day. "Ours is a labor of love." *We believe in the bodily resurrection of the just and unjust. . . .*

The Cleveland Colored Quintet sings "The Monkey's No Relation of Mine"; Brother Eldon Farrar blows sweetly on a trombone. *The everlasting blessedness of the saved. . . .* On the hard seats children fall asleep. A man and a girl sit on "the mourners' bench," repenting their sins. Later there would be more. *And the everlasting, conscious punishment of the lost. . . .* Brother Paul William Rood, 43, pastor of Beulah Tabernacle, Turlock, Calif., opens a meeting. He is red-faced, friendly, oratorical, shakes your hand warmly with his soft one. He has been president of the Fundamentalists for three years. His church is the Swedish Evangelical Mission Covenant of America, but he says: "I might be a Mason or anything else. It would make no difference." The brothers and sisters listen quietly as he tells them that the "antediluvian conditions" of Noah's time are repeated today. Jesus Christ is coming. But "men today are defying man and humanizing God. Modernism is the religion of Cain."

Among the members of the Fundamentals Association are Mrs. Finley Johnson (Helen Gould) Shepard, Dr. Howard Atwood Kelly of Johns Hopkins (TIME, April 25), Dr. Mark Allison Matthews, famed Seattle pastor, Board Chairman Henry Parsons Crowell of Quaker Oats Co. They were not present in Columbus last week, but the following were:

*Christabel Pankhurst,* daughter of the late Suffraget Emmeline Pankhurst. Said she: "The world crisis is pointing to nearness of His coming because it fulfills closely His prediction of a crisis to precede His coming."

*William Bell Riley,* 71, executive secretary and co-founder of the Fundamentals Association. Patriarchal, resonant, he has debated many a time on Evolution. Proud is he that Clarence Darrow "backed down" when he offered him $500 to debate in Denver.

Rev. L. Entzminger of Texas was censured from the platform for his strong-arm methods.

* * * * * *

Back to their churchly muttons went the Fundamentalists last week. After organizing for Ohio their 7th state organization, planning a World Bible Conference and revival campaign for Chicago during the World's Fair next year, and laying the groundwork for an organization of European fundamentalists. One fundamentalist they may have missed last week but could read about in the newspapers. He was Noah Cooper, a lean, gaunt lawyer of Nashville, Tenn. He had been busy petitioning the Interstate Commerce Commission in Washington to require railroads to discontinue operations on Sunday. Six days a week does Lawyer Cooper labor. On Sunday he rests and he believes the rest of the world should, too. He succeeded in having the sale of gasoline prohibited in Nashville on Sunday, fought unsuccessfully against the operation of street cars. Once he began a movement to bar Sunday newspapers but learned they are printed Saturday night. Though Monday's papers are printed on Sunday, Lawyer Cooper felt he could not do without them. Seeking election to the State Senate, he stumped—string tie, high celluloid collar—with a Bible under one arm and a water-gourd given him by the W. C. T. U. under the other. He was overwhelmingly defeated. No minister is Lawyer Cooper but he calls himself the "Voice of Southern Methodism" In his petition to the I. C. C. he said that all U. S. railroad troubles stem from violations of divine command. The Pennsylvania Railroad objected that I. C. C. is without authority to "enforce the Ten Commandments or any one of them." Last week I. C. C. agreed.—*Time*.

## The Consecration of the New Primate of Sweden

By the Rev. Eric Ringenhjelm
Deacon, Diocese of Chicago

Stockholm, June 6, 1932.

An event of historic importance for Sweden took place on Trinity Sunday in the consecration and installation of the new Archbishop, Erling Eidem, in the presence of a congregation of 3,000 persons which filled the Cathedral at Upsala. This large gathering was thoroughly representative of the whole country, as it included the King of Sweden and several members of the royal family, three Ministers of State, the speakers of the Upper and Lower Houses of Parliament, the heads of the universities, representatives of the learned professions and commerce, delegations of students, and many others too numerous to mention. It showed, in a remarkable way, the close connection between Church and State which exists in Sweden. It is doubtful if in any other country in Europe such a gathering could be brought together for an ecclesiastical function. No less striking was the number of bishops who took part in the consecration, and the Church and countries which they represented.

Eleven Swedish bishops were present out of twelve, one Danish, one Norwegian, one Finnish, the German Bishop of Holstein, and, representing the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of Fulham. His participation in the consecration on the part of England was warmly welcomed as a symbol of that unity among Christians to which we aspire, and which the late Archbishop Söderblom had done so much to promote. No orthodox bishop was present, but the Greek Orthodox Church was represented by Dr. A. de Roubetz, who was seated in the chancel among representatives of the Free Churches in Sweden, and a large number of Swedish clergy.

The service commenced punctually at 11 o'clock with Palastrina's Sanctus, sung by a choir of boys. It may be stated that as in all Swedish churches the organ and the choir are in a gallery and not in the chancel. This was followed by "Högmässan," the usual Sunday service in Sweden. Although the English translation of "Högmässan" is High Mass, the service is really the Ante-Communion, as there is no consecration of the Elements, and the service consists of prayers, the creed, the epistle and gospel, and a sermon, interpersed with hymn and psalms.

The officiants clad in white albs, and wearing copes as is the custom in Sweden at this service, were the dean and the sub-dean of the Cathedral. The dean preached the sermon for Trinity Sunday from the text appointed for that day (St. John 15: 1-9) for, strange as the custom appears to us, the text of the sermon is fixed by law for every Sunday, like the epistle and gospel for the day.

It was now 12:30, and on the conclusion of this service the procession of bishops entered for the consecration. They had previously been seated near the pulpit for the first part of the service. They retired to robe during the singing of the Te Deum and entered, all wearing mitres and copes, and carrying their pastoral staffs. The procession was headed by the chaplain of the late Archbishop Söderblom, carrying the new Archbishop's pastoral staff, then followed the Swedish bishops, and visiting bishops in order, then two of the Cathedral clergy carrying the cope and mitre of the new Archbishop, and lastly the Archbishop himself, clad in a white rochet with a red girdle. Three Swedish bishops standing in front of the altar conducted the service, while the remainder, including the *pastor primarius* as leading representative of the Swedish priests, and the two Cathedral clergy bearing the Archbishop's vestments stood round the altar rail. It should be explained that the altar rail is circular in form in Swedish churches. The three Swedish bishops vested in their copes and mitres, standing before the altar, and the circle of bishops similarly vested made a striking picture, amidst which the new Archbishop in his simple white rochet stood out clearly. It is satisfactory to be able to say that although most northern bishops are tall and striking men, the Bishop of Fulham towered above them, and the cope which he wore was the most handsome there.

Bishop Bergqvist of Lulea, the most northern diocese in Sweden, conducted the consecration service, and addressed the new Archbishop

at length on the dignity and duties of his high office, recalling the long line of his predecessors and especially Archbishop Söderblom whose memory will always be cherished by the Christian Church. Then the chancellor of the diocese read the royal mandate of the appointment of the Archbishop.

The Archbishop recited the Apostles' Creed in clear and audible tones. The presiding bishop asked him three questions very much on the lines of the English Ordinal to which he replied in the affirmative. Each bishop then read a verse from the New Testament, commencing, "Jesus said." The verses were read in Swedish, English, and German. The Bishop of Fulham's verse was, "When ye have done all, say we are unprofitable servants."

Then the Archbishop knelt down, the choir intoned "Veni, Creator Spiritus" and all the bishops present as well as the three priests laid their hands upon his head. The two Cathedral clergy vested the Archbishop in his robe of cloth of gold, the presiding bishop placed the mitre on his head and his pastoral staff in his hand. The services concluded with prayer and the procession wended its way back to the vestry, the new Archbishop at the head.

In the afternoon a dinner was held for 160 guests over which the Archbishop presided. He proposed the toast of the foreign bishops, and among others the Bishop of Fulham replied, conveying a greeting from the Archbishop of Canterbury in the name of the Church of England and expressing his own satisfaction at being in Upsala on this historic occasion.

The Swedish bishops held a conference on the 23d and 24th of May, the new Archbishop presiding and, among other decisions, a committee consisting of the Archbishop and two bishops was appointed to consider the promotion of closer relationship with other Churches. There is therefore good hope that the work in promoting Christian unity, for which the late Archbishop Söderblom did so much, will be carried on by his successor.—*The Living Church.*

## A College-Made Atheist

Great preachers have come out of Harvard, but a graduate of 1928, who went there with the idea of entering the ministry, came out lost to religion.

The story is of the institution endowed by an English clergyman, but it might have been of any of the large universities of the country in which ancient religious concepts and doctrines find little place alongside modern scientific instruction. Whether they make atheists of their graduates is another question, though it is commonly charged that some of them do. Yet God's name is heard in their chapels, and they still provide candidates for the ministry.

Whether Philip E. Wentworth's experience is typical is also another question. Queen Victoria had been ded but five years at his advent into life, and her spirit was the tutelary genius of his childhood and youth. He was accustomed to family prayer, and his belief in

God and the Presbyterian doctrine, including predestination was unwavering when he was ready for college, he tells us in *The Atlantic Monthly*. He was destined for the Presbyterian ministry, and the fact gladdened the heart of his family and local minister.

He decided to go to Harvard, and insisted against the advice of his minister, who was afraid of what actually happened.

The change, Mr. Wentworth writes, was first brought home to him in the study of history. "All events in history were manifestations of cause and effect operating upon the natural level. The institutions of society evolved according to orderly processes. Religion was itself subject to these processes." In this orderly universe there was no place for a "wonder-working God. He would be an outlaw, unthinkable and impossible."

Life lost its meaning for the young student; he became desolate. He tried to rehabilitate his idea of God by setting Him up as the First Cause, the moving power behind natural law. But such a God was to remote, too inaccessible for the purposes of religion.

"I saw, too," writes Mr. Wentworth, "that the Modernists were troubled by these same difficulties. In their haste to strike up a compromise with the intellectuals, they were trying hard to make a self-respecting Deity out of the nebulous What-Is-It of Eddington and Millikan. It seemed to me that they had fallen between two stools. I studied philosophy and read further about this First Cause. Then I began to marvel at the disingenuousness of the human mind when, unable to imagine how the world began, but demanding some explanation of the inexplicable, it can arbitrarily select three letters from the alphabet and call g-o-d an answer. I preferred to think that we know more about such matters when we admit we know nothing than when we resort to such palpable self-deception."

Twisted out of his early belief, Mr. Wentworth gave up the idea of entering the ministry, and now, four years after his graduation, his ideas have undergone no important modification. The whole system of religious conceptions has lost its validity for him.

"College," he writes, "not only may, but often does, deprive a student of his religious convictions without giving him anything to take their place." As he sees it,

"Christianity, after all, is a composite of two elements: one purports to explain the nature of the world and man's relationship to the God who rules over it; the other prescribes a course of conduct the sanctions of which are derived from this relationship.

"The really serious dangers of skepticism become apparent when a student rejects the supernatural part of his religion and concludes that there are no valid reasons left for decent conduct. Robbed of standards, he is likely to adopt the easy ethics of business, which permit a man to do almost anything so long as it leads to success in money-making. This commercial point of view is rapidly becoming the real philosophy of the nation, as Mr. Adams brilliantly demonstrates in 'The Epic of America.'"

Though he is an apostate, says Mr. Wentworth, it gives him no satisfaction to realize what a large number of young men and women wear the same label. But he sees no help for it. "The Church has lost its power to move us. Its conceptions seem as unreal to my generation as the gods of ancient Greece." He considers "the breakdown of Christianity" particularly unfortunate in America, "where our educators are so busy building new dormitories and thinking up new systems of instruction that they do not see how urgently the situation calls upon them to redefine the purposes for which their pedagogical machinery exists." He concludes:

"In so far as the colleges destroy religious faith without substituting a vital philosophy to take its place, they are turning loose upon the world young barbarians who have been freed from the discipline of the Church before they have learned how to discipline themselves. Perhaps this was what one of my least orthodox Harvard professors had in mind when he once said: 'There are only a few men in the world who have earned the right not to be Christians.'"

Now, this possessor of a sheep-skin attributes his backsliding to Modernism and a college education, which have been used by others, too, to cover a multitude of sins. He cites Dr. Robert A. Millikan, the famous scientist, as one of the Modernists who find it difficult to accommodate God in the scientific view of the universe.

The simple fact is that Dr. Millikan doesn't. At the recent dedication of the University of Washington oceanographic laboratories, Dr. Millikan, as a dispatch to the New York *Times* quotes him, condemned a materialistic conception of the universe, and said that religion and science are not incompatible.

For Mr. Wentworth "to say that because he left his adolescent teachings in ruins he must needs lose his religion," comments *The Christian Register* (Unitarian), "is a pathetic admission of ignorance of the priority and permanence of religion and of failure to construct a new house of beliefs while the old one was falling down." And this liberal journal notes that—

"There were a dozen deeply religious and wise men in the Harvard faculty, apart from the theological school, who could have helped this young man out of his agonizing difficulty.

"He simply did not walk in the light. We have no sympathy whatever for his analysis of his experience. We think he does not understand either religion or himself.

"But we do feel deeply for his welfare, and we tell him that unsatisfactory as his article is, his own earnestness and his way of life are evidence enough for us that he has not lost his religion. We want to see him get his head straight on the meaning of religion. He can save himself."

And others do not find the campus a hotbed of atheism. Though he admits that "professors do not take for granted in these days the

sanctity of the Church, the Bible, or the Republican party," and that "they have put the supernatural in the museum of historic relics," the Rev. James M. Yard, Director of Religion at Northwestern University, does not find students becoming godless.

Writing in the New York *Christian Advocate* (Methodist), Mr. Yard says he agrees with Dr. Ernest F. Tittle, that "the interest of sudents today in religious, social, and political questions is greater—far greater—than ever," and "the students are feeling their way into a religion which will be in harmony and accord with the latest discoveries of science as to an ethical and social basis."

"They are turning away from agnosticism and negative things, and reaching out for faith," says Mr. Yard. "They are demanding a cause for which they can give their lives, and they are finding it as they dedicate their lives to the welfare of mankind in the fight against race hatred, militarism, and the paganism of our social and industrial life. As I see it, a growing number of them are 'getting' real religion."

—*Literary Digest.*

## "All His Saints Shall Praise Him"

To the Editor: It is often said that in order to keep our boys and girls in the Church we must give them something to do. But why specify the young people, for is that not true of us all? We all like to assist, as the French people express it, rather than merely to attend. But the thing which is so often overlooked is the fact that Our Lord has given to all of us something to do, just as much as He gave the first disciples when He instituted the great memorial of His passion in the Holy Eucharist, saying, "Do this in remembrance of Me."

St. Paul expresses the thought that I have in mind when he wrote "As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show forth the Lord's death till He come."

In laying great stress on the necessity of frequent partaking of the Holy Communion for the strengthening and refreshing of our souls, it is possible that we have in a great degree lost sight of that which is the at least equally important, if not greater aspect of, that sacred rite. In protesting against Rome we have neglected the Mass. It is true that the Anglican Church in her catechisms has taught for centuries that the right answer to the question, Why was the sacrament of the Lord's supper ordained? is that it was for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and only as we might say secondarily on account of the benefits we receive thereby. But unfortunately in an atmosphere of Protestantism she has relegated this first cause to the background, dismissing the thought of it in promptly laying so much stress on that which is of course of very great importance, the ways and means of preparing ourselves to receive the Holy Communion, with the result that many just "go to Communion" or stay away.

Now the point I wish to stress is that the first and greatest privilege of the one who has been confirmed is not as the new Office of

Instruction would seem to imply (page 291 of the Prayer Book) the reception of the Holy Communion for the continual strengthening and refreshing of the soul but the *privilege of taking part in a great pageant*, of being associated in any way, in the cast, or in the chorus or as an attendant (for I would rather be a doorkeeper, says the Psalmist, than to dwell outside,) in the presentation of the great Memorial Sacrifice before God. It is the highest act of Christian worship, this *offering of the sacrifice of praise* and thanksgiving, this continual representing of this remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ.

The officiating priest cannot adequately *do* it by himself. Some two or three at the least must be there to say Amen. Oh, that that "Lost Chord" could be restored, that that wonderful harmony could be heard upon the earth, Hallowed be Thy Name, as it is in heaven, not a note missing, not a voice silent, in the rendering of the great Amen. For worthy is the Lamb that was slain.

(Rev.) Arthur L. Walters, Reedley, Calif.—*The Living Church.*

## Exterior and Interior Solitude

It is said that when *Harry Emerson Fosdick* was a young and rather obscure minister in Montclair, New Jersey, he rented an office in a down-town building. He refused to install a telephone; indeed, hardly a soul, except his wife, knew the exact location of his "retreat." Here he isolated himself from the outer world, pored over his books, conjured up his thoughts, dreamed his dreams, wrote his sermons. Probably the power of his preaching today is due in large measure to those hours when he shut himself off from the madding crowd.

If you and I wish to circumvent today's tendencies toward extreme extraversion, we, too, must find times and places for isolating ourselves from the world that is all too much with us. Such isolation may be found in the quiet of our own rooms, out in the woods or fields, or while we walk some unfrequented city street. *Pro Vita Monastica* is the suggestive title of a book by Henry Dwight Sedgwick. It is a plea, of course, for the solitude one finds in the monastic life.

We mortals insist on feeding these bodies of ours thrice every day. What of our souls? What nutriment do we provide for them? Dr. Osler, the great Canadian physician, once advised a group of students to keep at their bedsides a small table containing the Bible and other books of inspiration, and to feed their interior selves daily and at regular times with the ideas which the saints, seers and poets of the ages have bequeathed to us. Have you such a "library of the spirit?" An excellent anthology of ancient and modern "scripture" which might well be the beginning of such a library is *Great Companions* edited by Robert French Leavens, and published by the Beacon Press, of Boston.

In his *The Art of Thinking*, a book which should have been titled The Art of Contemplation, Abbe Dimnet suggests that we need not only exterior solitude and isolation, but *interior solitude;* that we should retreat on occasions not only from the world of men and of things, but

from the world of our own distracting thoughts. What he means, of course, is that we must engage in the business of cultivating our power of attention and concentration.

The difficulty is (Arnold Bennett somewhere uses a like illustration) that our minds behave like a bad little boy sent on an errand to the grocery store. After a few blocks he looks up an alley and discovers some of his friends playing marbles so he must needs put off the grocery business for a few minutes until he tries his luck. On the way home a fire diverts his attention for a half-hour while his mother waits. So with our minds. We send them on errands, but soon they are diverted by matters as inconsequential as marbles and fires. But we can train them to obey us—and we must train them if we are to cultivate the world within.

Years ago some Hindu scholars visited Harvard University. They were particularly desirous of meeting the great psychologist William James. In conversing with him, one of the visitors said: "I do not see how it is possible for you to live as you do without a single minute in your day given to tranquility and meditation. It is an invariable part of our Hindu life to retire at least a half an hour daily into silence . . to meditate on eternal things. Every Hindu child is trained to do this from a very early age."

We Occidentals can instruct Orientals in the draining of swamps, the building of railways, in mechanically tilling, seeding and harvesting, and a thousand other arts which our inventive genius has brought into being, but the Oriental is our master in the art of meditation. He knows far better than we what the psalmist meant when he admonished: "Commune with thine own self upon thy bed and be still."

—(*From the Bulletin of a Cleveland church.*)

# Book Review

NOTE—*Reviews, when not signed, are by the Editor.*
*(When ordering books, please mention this Magazine.)*

**Religion and the Modern Mind,** edited by *Chas. C. Cooper*, Head Resident, Kingley House, Pittsburgh, Pa. Harper and Brothers, Publishers, New York and London, 1929. 277 pages.

From his experiences with "the Hungry Club" (an intellectual forum, at Pittsburgh) the editor thinks he can state that the interest in religion is growing in many classes. Whether this interest is to lead to a restatement or abandonment of religion he is not prepared to say. But it can be confidently affirmed that in this rising tide of interest there is a total lack of reference to creeds and dogmas, once deemed so important in this sphere. Further, while the believers in the "old-time religion" are still in the majority, there is a small liberal minority in most churches who feel that they have more in common with those in other camps than their fathers would ever have admitted. From the addresses delivered in "the Hungry Club" we have a selected number in this book. They are from people in different stations in life and very divergent in standpoint.

Professor Barnes writes from the viewpoint of agnosticism. He says, "of all forms of influence retarding intellectual and institutional growth, organized orthodox religion is the most sinister." The whole orthodox spirit world is, according to him, wiped out at one gesture by the introduction of the scientific method. Even Jesus is to him only a man of gentle love, whose memory should be observed by a "Be-kind day." The search for a cosmic God and the look for a God within are both futile. No credible substitute can be found for the old interpretation of human destiny. In the coming rearrangement of society the only functions church and minister will have to perform will be to get ardent popular support for the findings of science.

Professor Ames represents psychology. In the past agricultural society, he tells us, religion had been more a matter of contemplation and meditation; today, when the city man has more control of life in his hands, it will consist more of active efforts in doing things: in building a heavenly kingdom, creating a society in which men may live together with understanding, sympathy and cooperative power.

The astronomer H. D. Curtis gives a very interesting chapter on science and religion. With regard to the chief tenet of religion, the faith in God, he says that his reason is forced to the conclusion that more facts in this supremely wonderful universe are explained by the "working hypothesis" of a God than by any other possibility.

John L. Elliott, speaking for the Ethical Culture Movement, pays a tribute to F. Adler, its founder. Adler, trained for the profession of a rabbi, withdrew from the synagogue because of his disbelief in God. The ethical culture people believe faith in man more important than faith in God. There is a possible worth in all men and those who recognize this and are trying to help them to realize the promise that is in them, are the really great men. Jesus was great because he had sympathy with the lowest. "The socialized idea of the divine has the power not only to fulfill the aspirations of the past, but also to create a new power and a new sanctity in the future. This socialized idea the Ethical Culture Movement is attempting to realize and cherish in the world."

Bishop McConnell brings the volume to a conclusion with a paper on the Christian conception of religion. The Oriental people are in a way more religious than we. Religion enters into more aspects of life. But their religion is not concerned about the well-being of their neighbors. The Jewish prophets, on which our religion is built, completely moralized religion. He quotes Micah's famous passage ("do justly, love mercy and walk humbly before thy God"). Jesus would forgive misconception and mistreatment of himself, but he has words of withering wrath against greed and those who enjoyed the comforts of this life and had no place for Lazarus in it. "The social question, so called, by which we mean the problem of all human contacts, especially those arising out of men's relation to the material world, is the essential test of religion."

An interesting book, that will have an appeal to all who are willing to listen how the other fellow thinks of the great questions in life.

**A Rabbi Takes Stock,** by *Solomon Goldman.* Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1931. 247 pages.

In this scientific age religion is often despised because of its admixture of superstition and supernaturalism; so also is nationalism because it has often been the cause of war. Still, the author comes to the defence of both: of religion as a means of making the world better and of nationalism as representing the totality of a people's loftiest aspirations. He believes that Israel best shows the power of true religion and sound nationalism. The writer is a pretty severe critic of Reformed Judaism as well as of Orthodoxy, but although mentioning the Conservatives, he does not make it very clear to what part of "conservers" he belongs. He claims that both Jewish Reform and Orthodoxy cling to the theology of the Middle Ages. The outsider certainly fails to understand how this charge could apply to the liberal Rabbis. The author himself is a liberal. He is profoundly convinced that orthodoxy is an anachronism. Its rabbis "examine cows and chickens," they chew tobacco in the synagogues, they put the ban on choirs. They pour brimstone on the Hebrew Union College (the Reform Seminary at Cincinnati), and yet they themselves have nothing to show in intellectual achievements.

What he misses in the great liberal rabbis (who "build million dollar temples") is the fact that they are not nationalists; they don't believe in Zionism. (Our "liberal" Rabbi Silver here is a staunch upholder of Zionism though. Editor.) To the author there is no nation in all history that has so tenaciously defended and maintained its individuality as the Jews. The fact that they did, he says, is their uniqueness; and that we persist in it is our pride. The consciousness of four thousand years of uninterrupted history in the memory of the Jew—*this is Israel!* This survival of national consciousness is according to him not due to the ethical monotheism worked out by the prophets and taken over by the Jews. The Jews never had an abstract, fixed idea of God. They were concerned with right living, not with metaphysical terms and discussion. History shows that in their God-idea there is a decided growth from the crude conceptions of Genesis to the exalted view of Isaiah and the rest of the leaders. What explains the permanency of the Jewish race is the vague feeling of oneness. This oneness was largely the result of their being kept under the law. Their cultural homogeneity is the secret of their survival. They have a national religion, a common code of conduct, their folkways, a land and a common language (Hebrew). "Judaism is universalism experimenting with one people. They are a nation, not merely a missionary society!"

This may all be true to some extent. There were various factors that account for the remarkable phenomenon of their abiding racial character. The "significance and importance of law in life may be the very essence of his people's contribution to humanity." Still, the monotheism of their belief and the ethical character of their religion, as derived from the prophetic leaders, is doubtless the main explanation for their undying persistence. If, as the author says, in spite of all changes and their own faults, their God, their Torah and their prophets remained steadfast, he seems himself to admit the fact.

The writer is of course very proud of his people. He often doesn't see the dark side. For instance, he won't even concede that Israel was ever cramped by their law. In view of what he himself says about the backwardness of the Orthodoxy of the Synagogue, this statement seems absurd. He says it is a libel made popular by the writers of the New Testament that the Jew ever sacrificed man to the Sabbath.

The book sees the future of Judaism largely influenced by the development of Zionism. In Palestine the Jew feels at home, no matter whence he comes. Christianity has failed to be the universal religion. What fellowship, he asks, has the Protestant with the Catholic? Judaism never attempted it but has succeeded in welding religion and nationhood together in the one people.

A very pathetic chapter is that on the persecutions of the Jews in Poland and Russia. We had never read anything as terrible as some of the incidents related here. We refer especially to the kidnaping, on a large scale, of Jewish children in Russia, under Nicolas I. These children were carried to Siberia. "They worked hard all day at military service; at night they were flogged, made to crouch on their bare

knees for hours; they were scorched and pinched to bleeding." That was the Russian way to make Christians.

The author's "taking stock" results in a rather critical appraisal of existing currents and schools of thought in modern Jewry. His own viewpoint and the size of support he has back of him among his fellow-religionists, have not sufficiently been described.

His heart is in the national aspect of the problem and therefore, in Zionism. Palestine can't be the home of all Jews. The Arabs outnumber the Jews there four to one. Besides, millions of Jews don't want to go there if they could. As a cultural influence Zionism, its institutions and ideals, will probably play a great role in the future of Judaism.

**Experiences Facing Death,** by *Mary Austin.* The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Indianapolis, 1931. 301 pages.

Mary Austin is the author of nine other books besides this one. One of them, entitled "A Small Town Man" sought to give an interpretation of Jesus. Its thesis was that Jesus, although a religious genius, was, at the same time, a product of his environment. He had the limitations of outlook you would expect in a man brought up in a simple social system. His social teachings cannot be applied to modern conditions. We live under a capitalistic system where the personal relations and responsibilities of earlier civilizations cannot be made to operate. We don't know the other nine books but from the one before us we imagine they must be very unusual.

The author tells us that through some sickness she was once confronted with death and when in that condition, she felt that she was afraid of it. She hastens to tell us that it was not on account of the conventional ideas about heaven and hell—she had long ago shed those ancient beliefs. No, she feared because she felt she had to leave this beautiful world and this beloved human existence and she did not know what kind of a life and world she was going to enter upon. Is there such a world and which is the best way to arrive at certainty? Can we, by any sort of experience, come to definite results?

She knows well that science knows only one kind of experience, that of measurability; and experience that can be repeated by applying scientific methods and instruments. But modern psychology teaches us, or ought to teach us, that whatever produces a start, an alteration, a motion of the psyche, is an experience (but such an experience doesn't prove the reality of the producing factor; an imagination may affect the psyche very strongly at times.—Reviewer.) Mankind has always searched for a subjective approach to Immaterial Reality. Man has always been—to that—extent—a religious being. It has ever been impossible to prove the existence of God by strictly intellectual argument, but men have gone on just the same to commune with him.

Now the author goes off in unexpected fashion to show us how she learned to get in touch with Reality. God never was to her a person. Her experiences of God had the feel of a Presence but this Presence

never manifested itself as a personality. She would rather call it the "Great Unconscious." There is religion everywhere in the world and wherever it is it has built up a technique whereby it makes an impression on the psyche. When the writer had left the Methodist Church, whose morality, creeds and heaven had long cramped her spirit, she lived in the west and was neighbor to some Indian tribe. She at once got initiated into their religious customs and began to "experience" their religion. She followed this up later in the most astonishing way. She tells us she learned much from the "primitives." For instance, their belief in the "Sacred Middle," the idea that in the centre of the ganglia system there is stored up everything that happened in the life of the race. It represents the ages when man had not arrived yet at intellectualization but was guided by feeling-knowledge. There are surer traces of his destiny found there than in the reasonings of his intellect. All primitives have ideas of the future life and they have no horror of death.

She did not stay, however, with the primitives. She used the Catholic technique of devotion, the fourteen stations; the exercises of the Jesuits and numberless other methods. She had a long experience in the "mystic way", the "Unitive Life". She found, by the way, relief from pain by self-hypnotization (by projecting her consciousness into a "remote blue spark"). She also discovered that relying on the "Sacred Middle" and its promptings was very much the same as the method of the mystic way or the practice of the creative artist when in the act of giving life to the creatures of his fancy.

It would be presumptuous for us to say that we had followed the writer all along into her devious paths. We had expected something different from the title; had expected a description of the effect of the presence of death on various individuals. Instead, we get in the book the unusual spectacle of a person who apparently used every religion she came in contact with as a means for psychological gymnastics, without any attempt to discriminate. She just followed, and practised on, her "Sacred Middle" as a surer guide than the intellect. On the question, Is there a hereafter, is there an immaterial Reality? we get no new light.

**My Life Story—From Archduke to Grocer,** by *Leopold Woelfling* (Ex-Archduke Leopold of Tuscany). With Frontispiece and eighteen other illustrations. E. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., New York. 284 pages.

This is not a theological book, but why need it be? We read other books and a book that throws intimate light on Emperor Francis Joseph of Austria and his family will be sure of general attention at this time. We had always thought that the words of the Austrian national hymn:

"Gott erhalte Franz den Kaiser,
Unsern guten Kaiser Franz!"

applied very fittingly to the late Francis Joseph. In other words, that

he was a good man—as emperors go—and that he was well beloved. But when we read this book, written by the son of one of the emperor's cousins (archduke Ferdinand IV of Tuscany) we get a different impression. According to the author, Francis Joseph was an arch-despot. He was the head of the whole Hapsburg family and obedience to—and almost worship of—the emperor was the real law of each member's existence. There was no redress or appeal from the decision of the emperor. Ordinary citizens might have recourse to the law, archdukes had not. To make this dependence more sure, it was the emperor's steady policy to instill fear.

It so happened that the emperor from the beginning had an antipathy to the writer of this book (allegedly on account of the nephew's democratic leanings). He disturbed his career in the navy and in the army. He even had him shut up in an insane asylum for months (!) and the poor fellow got out only through a successful ruse. The writer loved Elvira, the daughter of Don Carlos, the pretender to the throne of Spain, but he was forbidden to marry her.

The writer's mother, although more fitted to be a nun than a wife, bore her husband twelve children. She was a tool of the priests while her husband hated them. Her oldest son, Leopold (the writer of the book), claims that she never had any love for him. One of his sisters, Louise, married the crown prince of Saxony (later king). It was no love match and led, as our readers will remember, to a great European scandal. Louise, mother of five children, ran away with the language teacher, Giron. The writer takes special pride in saying that he helped his sister to elope. Her husband, he says, was without any artistic interests and so Louise sought the company of Giron, who possessed a cultured mind. Leopold conducted the sister to Switzerland. She later married a singer, but the book furnishes no information on her subsequent career.

Interesting detail is given about the empress Elizabeth, wife of Francis Joseph. She never loved him. "She worshiped her own beauty, would stand hours before the mirror. Devoted her whole life to *not being fat*. Her main bent was to be majestically miserable." (She doubtless had a strain of the Wittelsbach abnormal temperament). The story of her assassination by an anarchist, at Geneva, is well known.

The old emperor had many tragedies. The crown prince Rudolf was in love with a Miss Vetsera. Tradition has it that they both committed suicide at Meyerling. The author tells us (from his father) that Rudolf was struck over the head with a bottle (pieces of green glass were still lodged in the dead man's skull) in a drunken brawl, and then the woman killed herself.

Now Francis Ferdinand became heir apparent. He was one of the most dissolute characters (the writer has some very salacious stories about him). At the same time he hated Leopold (the author). This drove Leopold away from home and country. He couldn't take part in the Great War; took the name of Woelfling and began the hard struggle for a living, not having trade or profession or a head for business:

hawked sausages in Berlin, was a small grocer in Vienna; then an insurance agent.

He had very bad luck in two marriages with working class women. It is hard to say which was more discreditable, his total lack of judgment and ordinary common sense in selecting a wife, or his telling the story of his wives' deficiencies to the public. A man may do many things when he needs the money, but here he violates good taste, and besides, this part of his story is the least interesting.

The author's political sympathies were with the liberal minds. He admired King Edward of England and shared with him his aversion for William II (the world's "greatest mischief maker" according to Edward).

The book gives interesting glimpses into the character and family life of old Francis Joseph. The political questions arising from the warring nationalities of the Dual Empire are not even mentioned. The practical and financial helplessness of a man so well educated, speaking several languages, is astounding.

The book is written in the purest English. Could such a man find nothing better than peddling sausages in Berlin?

**The Secret of a Quiet Mind.** The Building of the Life Within by the *Rev. John S. Bunting* (Rector of the Church of the Ascession, St. Louis). Fleming H. Revell Co., Chicago, 1929. 127 pages.

These Studies are the result of several years' instruction of a class in "Religion and Health" in the Church of the Ascension, St. Louis. "They emphasize one theme and focus attention upon one need, how to hear more clearly the Voice of God amid the confusion of the time, how to find his hand and see more definitely the pathway that leads to him through the fields of obscurity which spread about the soul today." The author thinks that people are yearning today more than ever for a Presence, a power beyond all human help; that, therefore, they, or many of them, are ready to be led to the divine sources in the way that is the only way, the way of prayer. Organized, institutional Christianity can do little for them. What they need is not science, theology, or ritual; what they need is the old and often despised or forgotten way of the mystics. From them they can learn the secret of the quiet mind, which consists in letting God do things through us. God is always doing big things silently (in nature, in history, in individuals). We are doing small things with much of fuss and noise. We must learn to relax, to let go; must learn this by systematic effort, guided by the experts in the inner life, the mystics. Must learn from them to travel the steps we may call "attention, concentration, surrender, supplication, resolution." Progress will come "from within outward." We are surrounded by mysterious forces in the spiritual world as in the natual. The forces playing on our souls are mighty and beneficent. Almost anything can happen. Have faith, you are more likely to succeed than to fail.

One must learn to "get at himself." "Your unhappiness, ill health and failure in life are due in large measure to your not having gotten hold of yourself, the whole of yourself, mind, body, spirit. You will get at yourself by going to God in quiet prayer. God has control of a large and glorious part of you, your soul, in fact your soul's life is God's life. If you find God you'll find yourself. That will solve your problem, make you happy, add to your usefulness and charm."

"Each of us must learn the beautiful spiritual art of making a bundle of all fears, defeats, negations, impossibilities, antagonisms, disappointments, moods and grouches and put them into the hand of that dear and infinite Friend, the good Phsician, the greatest of all Masters, and simply beseech him to carry them away. The amazing thing is that he will absolutely do it." Health will come to the body as well as peace to the soul, the writer contends.

With persuasive confidence and in entire simplicity the author again and again unfolds the beauties of the prayer life, the marvelous blessings it brings to the struggling soul. He believes it is necessary to use the methods of those who were ever the pioneers in the spiritual life. One should have a regular time and place (even a "prayer table" with cross and devotional books on it).

If we use the hidden springs of life "then the door within which swings on double hinges (so the mystics say) inward toward God and outward toward the world, will open into your life all that fulness of power which comes to the aid of the sick body, giving it strength, and to the smitten mind, giving it calmness and quiet. When you do this, you will find yourself in a new world."

**A Country Parson Looks at Religion,** by *Harold A. Prichard*, M. A. (Oxon) D.D. (Rector of St. Mark's Church, Mt. Kisco, N. Y.) Harper and Brothers, 1931. 282 pages, $2.25.

The author believes that people stay away from church because it doesn't preach acceptable and modern views on such vital subjects as the Church, the Bible, the Creeds and the Sacraments. If it learns to do that the time will come when the church will be "the official expression of the beliefs and actions of all sane people." The writer feels that he, although only a "country parson" and therefore of little consequence, has in him the urge to contribute a little to this task of brining the church up to date. There is only one means of amelioration in the serious state of the modern world, he says, and that is to apply the principles of Jesus—the mind of Jesus—to one's daily and practical needs. This is the real purpose of religion and all developments and practices of the church that are not consistent with this ought to be rejected.

What is religion? is the first question he raises. Is it morality? Is the church's chief task to keep people out of jail? Is it philosophy, ritual or an ecclesiastical institution? All these things may contain valuable elements, but they are only means to an end. The end is interpreting the Christian life to the world. In this interpretation

the church ought to be the main agent, but the fact that the East is willing to accept Christ but not the church shows that there is something wrong with the church.

The first subject to engage the writer's attention is, naturally, the first article of the creed, *God*. He emphasizes both the transcendence and the immanence of God. To him it is a personal God, however much we have to think away the limitations that inhere in the conception of human personality. The most distinctive teaching the Christian religion here presents is contained in the word "Trinity." The writer does not even try to explain the depths and the seeming impossibilities that lie hidden in this belief. No layman, he says would understand it, and no minister would be benefited by it. He is opposed anyway to philosophical or meta-physical discussions. To him it means simply that we know God in Christ and that the powers of the Holy Spirit are at our disposal, so that all things are possible to him who is in Christ.

The *Bible*, in the next chapter, calls for extended comment. He points out that the old view of its inerrancy is no longer tenable, that it is a view no longer held by well informed Christians. Evolution was once hotly and bitterly fought by the apologists; today it is accepted by the majority of American scholars and churchmen. Again, we are going back from Paul and his theology to the simple teachings of the Synoptics. "One cannot be a disciple of Paul, the theologian, and of Jesus, the Son of Man." Protestantism, he says, has raised the Bible to a place it has no claim to. Luther declared that the Bible had produced the church, a "fallacy" in which the Protestant churches followed him. We think the writer here excites himself unnecessarily. Luther knew very well there was a church before there was a Bible. When he said "the Word had made the church and would also sustain it," he didn't mean the written or printed Bible; he meant the witness, the gospel of Jesus Christ had produced the church (at Pentecost). And over against the corruptions of Catholicism, it was the Bible as "far as it preached Christ" that was the foundation and source of the newly awakened Church.

The *Church* has also often lost sight of the fact that as an institution it is only a means to an end. The Roman Catholic puts the Church in the center of all his belief. Outside the Church there is no salvation. In the Anglican Church there is a wing, getting stronger and more insistent right along, which cultivates such extreme notions. The author says he could never side with them, the High-Church party and the Anglo-Catholics. Their doctrines of apostolical succession is rejected by all save their own adherents. The writer doesn't see why episcopal ordination and a certain view of the sacraments should be of so much weight to Christ or to Christians. Uniformity in outward respects is unessential; to be of the same mind spiritually, is what the Savior prays for.

The *Sacraments* were to Christ simple signs and symbols of his disciples sharing with him in the blessings of the kingdom. The external rite is as unpretentious as an ordinary meal. But it was

the last meal he had with them. Therefore he makes it a remembrance, a memorial, a keepsake. When his believers partake of it something happens in them, not in the elements. They consecrate their lives to a life of service and sacrifice. There is too much pageantry in our "Eucharist." Great crowded corporate communions, especially, are antithetic to the nature of the Sacrament. Christ gives his best to "two or three gathered in his name."

Of *Creeds* the author thinks little. At best they are for the enlightened few. For the many it is better to show up Christianity as a rule, a way of life, generated by the love of God in Christ, than to give them a theological system. The insistence laid on creeds is out of all proportion to their importance.

There are other chapters on Prayer, Sin, Immortality, Miracles. The author is far from denying authority to the church or the Bible. It is the authority resting on what both have accomplished in the life of the church, it is not infallibility.

He closes with reiterating what he contends for all through the book, that Christianity is a way of living, not a system of thought, an institution or a form of worship.

The author makes no claim to originality of argument or viewpoint. In fact he owns large indebtedness to Glazebrook's "Faith of a Modern Churchman", but he has evidently thought through very carefully every phase of his Christian philosophy. Like most Anglicans of his type, he is somewhat radical in some respects. Still we prefer him and his views to the Anglo-Catholic, who repudiates Protestantism and apes Roman Catholicism so successfully that it is hard to see a difference between him and the Romanist.

**World Revolution and Religion,** by *Paul Hutchinson.* The Abingdon Press, Cincinnati, 1931. 201 pages. „

"For the next hundred or two hundred years the world will be in the grip of revolution." Such is the startling statement with which the writer opens his survey of the political, social, intellectual and racial aspects of the situation. And organized religion will be hard put to it trying to survive. In fact it will not survive at all, at least not in its present form. One can see that the influence of the church is waning. Out in the mission field, Christianity is no longer the one and only religion, it is one of many. No matter in what direction one looks, the church is on the downward grade. It has a hard time now and it will have a worse one presently.

In four chapters the writer seeks to substantiate his thesis as applied to political, social, racial and religious conditions.

*Russia,* of course, is the land where the revolution has been most far-reaching and most successful. It has overturned a powerful, autocratic form of government and put in its place the rule of the proletariat. This new government rules over one hundred and fifty million people. It's a class-government, only the members of the communist party having any decisive share in it. But what we see in

Russia today is not simply a new political administration of public affairs. The revolution applies equally to the social, industrial and religious life of the people. Three classes of people are entirely excluded from the benefits of the new arrangement: the priest, the profiteer and the kulak. To begin with the first. The priest of the former Orthodox Church leads a most miserable existence; even the peasant despises him. The church, formerly a tool of the Czar, has had the same fate as the autocracy it served so willingly. The Russian Communist party has been atheistic from the beginning and the state of religion is getting worse apace. There have been executions and exiles on account of religion. No religious instruction must be given to children under eighteen. The education of youth in the public schools is entirely atheistic. The Society of the Godless is growing in number and influence. And this hostility extends to Zionists, Moslems, Catholics, Baptists alike. To the Communist, Marxism is his religion. The old religion is opium. Heaven is on earth; to make the Five-year plan successful is the present ideal. To live for profit is a loathsome and antiquated view of life. Under these circumstances no other fate seems in store for religion in Russia but extinction.

Passing to Germany, the author makes the astounding statement that he considers "the Lutheran Church of Prussia one of the most pitiful and impotent institutions he has ever seen." And this reckless denunciation because the Prussian Church did not take the republic to its heart, and on the basis of what some Liberals and Socialists have told him. As though these persons had gone to church even before the revolution. We who know the Prussian Church better, may deplore that the Church as a whole still wistfully thinks of the days of national splendor under the former kings, instead of adjusting itself to the present regime. But, then, how can one expect the church to have much love for a republic sponsored by Catholics and Socialists, the very classes it has fought for so many years, or centuries, in the past! Besides, those of us who came from the Western provinces of Prussia remember with gratitude the inspiration to religious living they received from a church as vital and spiritual as any we have seen in later years and after considerable wanderings.

The writer passes on to Italy where, he says, Fascism is making religion serve statecraft. Then to Turkey: "Kemal Pasha has modernized Turkey by secularizing it." To England: "The younger element of the Socialist party is almost totally out of touch with organized religion."

The Russion revolution is primarily *social*, only secondarily political. What got it the support of the 85% Moujik population was the fact that the land was distributed among them. Remember also the complete emancipation of woman. Nowhere in the world is their status as fully equal to man as there. In China, likewise, the change of government is followed or preached by efforts to raise the standard of the masses: anti-illiteracy, anti-opium movement. The Great War disillusioned the Chinese about the "Christian" nations. They saw

their faults; their selfishness (trade follows the missionary). The doctrinal content of Christianity they think not worthy of credence in the modern world. The outlook for religion in China can only be viewed with dismay.

In South Africa we see the rising tide of color. There is the reactionary Boer and the imperialist Britisher. Under communist training the Blacks say: Formerly we had the land and you (the foreigner) had the Bible. Now we have the Bible and you have the land. "Kick out the God of the missionary!"

In America the laborer is only a number on the pay-roll. The machine is grinding him to dust. The Western Church is playing only a puerile part in this vast drama. The person still counts in undeveloped, backward regions; in the city he has hardly any vital influence. To deal with social revolution the church must join the revolution.

The revolution is also a *racial* one. Christianity has done much to bring the present world tension to pass by preaching the solidarity of the race and equality before God and in Christ. But it is not willing to live up to its preaching. Skeptical France and irreligious Russia have no color question, but Protestant America has. The color bar in America is becoming an important issue. The new Negro demands his place in the sun. Finally coming more particularly to the *religious* revolution, the writer contends that the church is attacked as intellectually bankrupt, socially impotent and morally superannuated (!).

He takes up the Apostolic Creed, each item, from first to last, and seems to think that each one has no sound foundation any more. Science has dug it away from under our feet. There is no valid and substantial authority any more. Not the Church, nor the Bible—much less the creeds—not even the teachings of Christ—for does he not believe in demons and in the approaching end of the world?

The personnel of the church is mediocre. The minister's sermon is generally "stereotyped, pointless, passionless, having nothing to say that matters much to the men and women of our modern age." "The greatest enemy of the church's future is the church's present."

Organized religion is identified with a ruling class and will share its fate. Or if identified with any race (the "white man's religion") it will be given up when the other races assert themselves. Again, if a religion fails to meet the intellectual issues, and still more the ethical, it cannot hope to survive. Organized church life is guilty of all these things. Therefore it has no future.

And still religion will not die. Man needs a god of some sort. He needs the support of religion to sustain his passion for the higher values of life. But the new life and beginning will not come from the church; the church is too conservative, too much wrapped up with the status quo. It will come from individuals and groups outside the church (here he borrows from R. Niebuhr, to whom the book is dedicated). From people who have social intelligence besides religious fervor. They will be modern mystics, in their closeness to God.

We naturally say, but why mystics of all people? The mystics are the very ones who have no social objectives. They are solitary beings, who rise superior to the needs of the flesh and earthly life and station. It is true there is a Gandhi, who combines mysticism and the active love of his fellow men; but there are thousands who travel the mystic road but never lift the burden of the poor. Even St. Francis, the great Christian mystic, as true a lover of his neighbor as ever was, was espoused to the "Lady Poverty". His ideal was monkish, not modern or social at all.

The writer has drawn a picture as gloomy and distressing as ever was. He is a tired radical, and no wonder. If the church is all he says, intellectually bankrupt etc. (see above) who would not sit with the prophet under the juniper tree and sigh, "It is enough, O Lord, take away my life!" But there came forth men sent of God, calling to repentance and faith. As a rule they come out of the church, not outside of it. They were critics of the church, still they believe it was God's church, Christ's church and could again be used, after reform in head and member had been carried out. The author has nothing left apparently but Jeans's "stream of knowledge tending towards a non-mechanical reality" and Jesus Christ as "hero and captain of the Host." That isn't quite sufficient. If the whole creed about him is composed of material the modern man can only shake his head about, how can he be a real "Captain of the host?" No, we believe the author has poured out the child with the bathwater. He sees only the shortcomings of the church; the good points not at all. He knows no autority any more but the authority of Science. The modern world still needs Christ and his salvation. He will remain in the place of authority. He was also a believer in, and preacher of, the gospel of the kingdom of God. A hundred and nine times the term is used in the gospel. Let the church lift the treasure hidden here. Let it use the light coming from any quarter. Let it face the world and its task with the faith and the earnestness of the first Christians and it need not worry about its survival.